# REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 974 24 AA 000 093

THE ARTS OF LANGUAGE, NEEDED CURRICULA AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR INSTITUTES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS--LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, COMPOSITION, SPEECH AND READING, USOE CONFERENCE (UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, FEBRUARY 26, 1966 TO MARCH 1, 1966).

BY- OLSON, PAUL A.
NEBRASKA UNIV., LINCOLN
REPORT NUMBER BR-6-1764 PUB DATE 66
CONTRACT OEC-3-6-061764-0568
EDRS PRICE MF-[redacted] HC-[redacted] 234P.
$1.00 $9.36

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCES, *LANGUAGE ARTS, *INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE PATTERNS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), LITERATURE, COMPOSITION (LITERARY), READING, SPEECH, *LANGUAGE, LINCOLN

A CONFERENCE WAS HELD TO PRODUCE A DESCRIPTION OF NEEDED RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF THE INSERVICE RETRAINING OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE ALLIED AREAS OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, COMPOSITION, SPEECH, AND READING. FIVE POSITION PAPERS ON EACH AREA WERE READ ON THE 1ST DAY, AND THE LAST 2 DAYS OF THE CONFERENCE WERE SPENT DEVELOPING COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF THE POSITION PAPERS. INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT ARE THE FIVE POSITION PAPERS, THE FIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND AN ADDITIONAL REPORT ON THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS INSTITUTES DIRECTED TO TEACHERS OF THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED. IT WAS GENERALLY AGREED THAT INSTITUTES ON THE RETRAINING OF TEACHERS IN LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE TRAINING, AND LINGUISTIC USAGES SHOULD INCLUDE BOTH SCHOLARS AND EDUCATORS. (GD)

AA000093

6-1764

# THE ARTS OF LANGUAGE

## NEEDED CURRICULA AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR INSTITUTES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, COMPOSITION, SPEECH AND READING

ED011974

# THE ARTS OF LANGUAGE, 2

## Needed Curricula and Curriculum Development For Institutes in The English Language Arts: Language, Literature, Composition, Speech and Reading

Report of the
University of Nebraska
USOE Conference

February 26, 1966, to March 1, 1966

Contract Number OEC-3-6-061764-0568

Nebraska Curriculum Development Center

Edited by
PAUL A. OLSON,
Secretary to the Conference

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Participants of the Conference . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . iii

Representatives of the Professional Organizations as Observers at the Conference . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . vi

Introduction: The Drift of the Conference, Paul A. Olson . . . . 1

Reading in the Elementary Language Arts Institutes, William Iverson . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 31

Report of the Reading Committee, Robert Ruddell, Chairman . . 45

Recommendation for Components of the Elementary English Language Arts Institutes, Robert Allen . . . . . . . . . . . 75

Report of the Language Committee, G. Thomas Fairclough, Chairman . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 89

Speech in the Language Arts Institute, Kenneth Brown . . . . . . 109

Report of the Speech Committee, William Buys, Chairman . . . 127

Composition, Dorothy Saunders . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 157

Report on the Composition Committee, Albert Kitzhaber, Chairman . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 165

Teachers, Children, and Criticism, Bruce Mickleburgh . . . . . 181

Report of the Literature Committee, Stanley Felver, Chairman . 193

A Proposal for Institutes on Pre-School-Elementary English Language Arts for the Culturally Deprived, Jack Kittell, Chairman . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 217

The Arts of Language, Owen Thomas . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 221

# PARTICIPANTS OF THE CONFERENCE
# ON
# ELEMENTARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE-ARTS INSTITUTES
# ARRANGED BY COMMITTEES

## Composition Committee

Bailey, Dudley
English Department
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Borgh, Enola
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Cromartie, Sue
English Curriculum Study Center
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Hartsig, Barbara
California State College
Fullerton, California

Hunt, Joe McVicker
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Kitzhaber, Albert, Chairman
English Curriculum Study Center
Oregon University
Eugene, Oregon

Saunders, Mrs. Dorothy
5612 Parkston Rd.
Washington, D. C. 20016

Stegall, Carrie
P. O. Box 308
Holliday, Texas

Thompson, Nell
208 Andrews Hall
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Westendorf, Esther
Curriculum Center
Wantagh Public Schools
Wantagh, New York

## Language Committee

Allen, Robert L.
Teachers College, Columbia
University
New York City, New York

Carroll, John
Department of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Davidson, Sheryl, Mrs.
Westport School System
Bedford Elementary School
Westport, Connecticut

Fairclough, G. Thomas,
Chairman
Department of English
Midwestern University
Wichita Falls, Texas 76308

Hodges, Richard
School of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Kittell, Jack
University of Washington
College of Education
Miller Hall 111
Seattle, Washington 98105

McDavid, Raven
English Department
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

O'Banion, Laura, Miss
Winnetka School System
Winnetka, Illinois

Orris, Mrs. Edith
Green Gables School
Palo Alto, California

Thomas, Owen
English Department
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

## Literature Committee

Bryan, Miriam
Educational Testing Service
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Felver, Stanley, Chairman
Chico State College
Chico, California

Hedges, Ned
English Department
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Kuhn, Doris Young
R. R. 1
Lafayette, Indiana

Mickleburgh, Bruce
Room 301
30 Bloor Street W.
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Patterson, Edith
Supervising Teacher for the
Elementary Language Arts
Wilmington Public Schools
Wilmington, Delaware

Reid, Virginia
Oakland School System
5939 Mazuela Drive
Oakland, California 94611

Taylor, Mark
The School of Library Science
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Tway, Allene
University of Chicago Laboratory
School
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

## Reading Committee

Durkin, Dolores
7837 South Wood Street
Chicago, Illinois

Holmes, Jack
Department of Educational Psychology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Hovis, Lowell
Ravenna Elementary School
Seattle, Washington

Iverson, William
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Lefevre, Carl A.
7807 Oakwood Drive
Wonder Lake, Illinois

Rasmussen, Donald
Miquon School
Miquon, Pennsylvania

Ruddell, Robert, Chairman
Department of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Sabaroff, Dr. Rose
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Sebesta, Sam
Curriculum Center
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Sustakowski, Henry
State University College
Buffalo, New York

Torrant, Kay
Newton Schools
Newton, Massachusetts

Tyler, Priscilla
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Wilson, Rosemary
439 W. Price Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

## Speech Committee

Allen, Audrianna
Central Office
Seattle Public School System
Seattle, Washington

Brown, Kenneth
Department of Speech Education
School of Speech
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Buys, William, Chairman
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Faulk, Pearl
Advisor of Elementary Speech
Board of Education Offices
Tulsa Public Schools
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Higginbotham, Dr. Dorothy
Department of Speech
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Kibler, Robert J.
Psychological Research Center
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Oberle, Dr. Marcella
Department of Speech
Los Angeles State College
Los Angeles, California

Thurman, Mrs. Ann
Advisor of Creative Drama
Evanston Public Schools
District 85
Evanston, Illinois

# REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AS OBSERVERS AT THE CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE-ARTS INSTITUTES

Association of Departments of English
4 Washington Place
New York, N. Y. 10003

Janet Emig, Director
Master of Arts in English
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Commission on English of the College English Examination Board

Floyd Rinker, Director

International Reading Association
P. O. Box 119
Newark, Delaware

Leo Fay
College of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Modern Language Association
4 Washington Place
New York, N. Y. 10003

John Fisher, Executive Secretary
Michael Shugrue, Director, English Institute Materials Center

National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois

Robert F. Hogan, Assistant Executive Secretary
Eldonna Evertts, Assistant Executive Secretary

Speech Association of America
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

Previous commitments made impossible the attendance of any of the officers.

U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

Eugene Slaughter, Chief
Modern Language Institutes Branch
Division of Educational Personnel Training
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Sue Brett
Division of Research
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

# INTRODUCTION:

## The Drift of the Conference

The essay which follows carries the slender authority which the secretary of a conference acquires when he watches the mimeograph and encourages the flow and counterflow of papers, scholarly notes, and manifestoes among the conference's participants.

The abstract for the conference proposal is as follows:

> The purpose of the project would be to produce a description of needed research in the area of the in-service retraining of elementary-school teachers in the allied areas of language, literature, composition, speech and reading. The project is needed because: (1) The curriculum is undergoing a rapid change in these areas; (2) The NDEA institutes or other in-service training agencies have not come up with enough adequate proposals for retraining institutes or a sufficient number of adequate curricula to accomplish the in-service job implied by new curricula; (3) Research clearly needs to be done as to how adequate in-service curricula can be created in the area and as to how a sufficient number of adequate retraining programs can be created.

It should be remembered that, under Office of Education rubrics, research includes curriculum development--including the development of curricula for institutes.

On February 26-March 1, 1966, the group listed in the roster met for about three days--and worked over questions as to how America's teachers of grades 1-6 might be trained (or better, retrained) as scholars and teachers of the English language and its resources.

The procedure of the conference was that five commissioned position papers were first read: the paper on Reading by Mr. William Iverson, on Speech by Mr. Kenneth Brown, on Composition by Mrs. Dorothy Saunders, on Language by Mr. Robert Allen, and on Literature by Mr. Bruce Mickleburgh. Subsequently, the committees spent two days and much of two nights developing committee modifications and extensions of the position papers.[1] The report may be regarded as conceived in exhaustion. What is published here are the five position papers, the five committee reports and the additional report of the *ad hoc* committee on the special problems of English language arts institutes directed to teachers of the culturally deprived--a number of which have been supported by the Office of Education. The group which gave the papers and did the discussing was selected for its diversity--library specialists, journalists, classroom teachers of every kind from every level in the

---

[1] The committees were chaired as follows: Reading, Robert Ruddell; Speech, William Buys; Language, G. Thomas Fairclough; Literature, Stanley Felver; Composition, Albert Kitzhaber; and Language for the Culturally Deprived, Jack Kittell.

schools, linguists with an interest in Afghani and psychologists with an interest in Plato--but the principle of selection which we used in seeking the group was that every teacher and school person invited should possess not only a genuine interest in the elementary schools but a substantial background of teaching children (or observing the behavior of children) or teaching and training classroom teachers. To dramatize the scholarly commitment of the group and its concern for schools (Aries suggests that the scholars abandoned the schools in the late Renaissance), we prepared a roster which set down all sides of a man's career. Curiously when one looked at a good number of the vitae of the roster, one noticed that it was impossible to tell from the record of scholarly and school work--without looking at present positions--whether a man or a woman would hang his hat in a so-called "academic" department, an "education" department, a coordinator's office or a school classroom. What characterized the group then was that it was made up of scholars from all levels of our perhaps artificially segmented school structure who had a particular concern for the application of language scholarship to the teaching of elementary school children and who were interested in the development of the elementary teacher's mastery of her trade as language scholar and teacher.

That the group, as a whole, had a full commitment to scholarship on the one hand and to excellent teaching on the other does not mean that the college people and the school people were always talking the same language, and, even in the final reports, you will observe some of that jargon which is the special weakness of academicians when they are reminding themselves of what they have thought rather than thinking. You will also observe some of the insistence on practical horse-sense, the insistence that scholarship be brought close to teachers and classrooms and kids, which is the special strength of classroom teachers. These reports should be written in what the eighteenth century would have called, "good, plain English;" they are not always.

The group met with a high sense of the possible successes and failures implied by its doing the right or the wrong kind of job: Iverson suggested that success in an institute program might mean that children might get daily to hear someone who loved language and knew its literary uses; Mickleburgh suggested that success might mean a Renaissance which would make that of the humanists and Encylopedists mean. And no one had to remind the group what the proposing of impractical or foolish English language training might mean for the child with speech or reading difficulties, the child handicapped by his dialectal or linguistic set, the child who cannot write what he thinks or think to write, or the child whose imagination has been disciplined by the eidola of no meaningful literary culture.

If the group was a complex group, aware of its business, it was also a political group. Perhaps no area of American education has been made more subject to the political in all senses than has the language education of the very young. We knew this. Initially when the Nebraska Center invited representatives of the professional groups, it did so because it was obviously "good politics"--that is, because we knew that, if the materials which follow were to carry any weight, they would have to include evidence of substantial participation by the professional societies: the IRA, the NCTE, the MLA, the ASA, the ADE, the Commission on English and so forth. (Incidentally, Mr. Mark Taylor observed to me that, from oversight, we had neglected to invite the ALA; I appointed him its unofficial-official spokesman.) We have undoubtedly forgotten about many organizations. Considering what the conference recommended, the Linguistic Society of America almost certainly should have been invited, and the number of other organizations concerned directly or indirectly with the language education of America's children is legion; but the group of professional organizations which was present has a sufficiently substantial claim to responsibility in the education of teachers as scholars and of children as speakers to speak for legions. One holds, with the Senator from New York, that those who wish to take the politics out of politics are a bit tiresome; what one could hope for in such a conference as the one reported here is that the tired political power which derives from no knowledge would be rendered trivial by the power which sometimes derives from knowledge and common sense. To a degree, this is, I believe, what happened. People did talk to one another--not _at_ one another; insofar as issues could be defined and programs proposed in short compass, they were. The conference was political in that it came to be concerned for the _polis_ of our academic "linguistic" society as it related to the "_polis_" of American society generally.

Owen Thomas in the essay which follows this urged the group to put aside its parochialisms as part of a search for a simpler way of viewing the art of language (including its most artful uses)--as part of a single concern for the curriculum burden on the bent shoulder of the elementary teacher. His sermon, given originally without a written text, rather obviously crystallized what was felt to be the purpose of the meeting from its beginning.

And to a degree, the conference did search for syntheses in a series of pictures of how language may be analyzed such as that proposed by Mr. Thomas; particularly did it search in possible extensions of "transformation" theory, "tagmemic" theory, and "communication" theory (the jargon is necessary at this point). However, it is fair to say that no such synthesis was created because we did not have the scholarship to create it. The approaches to the description of language and its uses mentioned above do not yet encompass, so far as the conference could see, the larger units with which students of composition and literature deal; though the literary people and rhetoricians of the conference were clearly abandoning the passionate generalities of their own approaches to the small units of language and turning to the precision of recent linguistic descriptions for help with paragraphs and sentences, style and prosody, and a wide variety of other matters, they had a confidence that the approaches to larger units which they are working out or which come from the traditions of literary and rhetorical criticism are still valid.

Indeed, the whole dialogue of the conference may be represented as a dialogue between those who regarded language and its uses from an analytic perspective, the perspective of disengaged "science," and those who regarded language and its uses from a contemplative perspective, the perspective of ordinary user--of wooer and contemplator of the ideal patterns in cultural and linguistic models: Bruce Mickleburgh set down the contemplative ideal for the scholar and teacher of literature ("Once he understands how and why literature constantly constructs a vision of what our world can be . . .") but the ideal has its relevance to other kinds of concerns in the area of composition, reading, speech and language. Indeed, it may be said that all of the areas which were represented at the conference are in process of scholarly transformation, and that the transformation was represented in the politics of the discussions: the reading area is coming to rely increasingly upon new analytic scholarship in language; in language, the early work of the disciples of Bloomfield and Sapir is being questioned by the perhaps even more analytic disciples of Chomsky and Pike; in speech, the work of classical rhetoricians is is being questioned, reshaped, and refined by analytic scholars who deal in communication theory and linguistics; in literature, the concern for density of meaning in literary works is being complemented by a concern to analyze larger generic and "mythic" patterns and the meanings which they bespeak;[1] and, in composition, the work of classical rhetoricians is, at certain levels, being reshaped by specialists in linguistics, logic, discourse theory and so forth.

---

[1] Or, for other schools of criticism, iconological patterns.

The passion of the conference was to find a way to help teachers to learn the analytic in new scholarship while heightening their opportunity to encounter the contemplative, the humane, the model--those "self-born mockers of men's enterprise" which, in language, in speech, in fiction and non-fiction, constitute the ends of that part of linguistic education which invites emulation rather than analysis. If recent experience with foreign language training tells us anything, it tells us that close analysis will allow the scholar and teacher to construct materials sufficiently carefully shaped to inspire "I-will-be-like-it" behavior in children; at the level of the construction of materials at least, the analytic and the emulative-contemplative may not be necessarily opposed.

If the conference came to a single view of the arts of language, it was, I think, that what is worth teaching teachers about is what is formed and systematic in language: in ordinary language, dialectal language, literary language or whatever--that is, the structure of rules, usages, resources which make speaking together possible. And what is systematic was thought to imply its own system of pedagogy, both for teachers and for the students of teachers; and here, obviously, we were influenced by conventional and widely known studies in the psychology of learning by Piaget, Bruner, Hunt, Carroll, and so forth. But if the members of the conference sought the structured as it could be identified both through an "I-thou" view of language and the systematic as it could be found through an "I-it" view, they did not come exactly to Thomas' neat system--but rather to the general view that what is known about the arts of language is a series of families of ways of looking at linguistic and artistic structure. Whether some of these are unnecessary or theoretically incoherent, one must leave to further scholarship.

That the conference did not come to an assertion that there is one means of viewing language means that the committees did not altogether abandon the parochial; a parish is where one lives. The Speech Committee report bears the marks of its being written by a committee of specialists primarily concerned with Speech; similarly, the reports of the committees on Composition, Language, and Literature bear the mark of the expertise of the people who served on the committee. Perhaps the committee which was most generously cosmopolitan in its deliberations was the Reading Committee, but even its report bears the marks of parish and former clerk. Perhaps we most assert the common claims of scholarship in the training of teachers when we most assert the unique claims of our own area; teachers perhaps will learn most about language, literature, composition, speech and reading, about the scholarly and imaginative-pedagogical acts necessary to the teaching of all of these, from an intensive work with literature (one could say the same for the claims of the other committees). But such a stance raises very real practical problems. In any case, the most authoritative guidance for the construction of institute curricula must be found in an intelligent weighing, by the individual scholar concerned with the designing of an an institute, of the opinions of the committees, the subcommittees, the individuals, recorded in the pages which follow. It is the job of the secretary of the conference to discover those drab commonplaces which seem to have been on everyone's lips, to speak the voice of compromise and prudence--those "rich ugly old maids courted by incapacity," and to make his private sense of what was said as public as possible.

## The Polity of Institutes:

The group endeavored to recommend an institute polity which would bring together the distinguished and divided worlds of "subject matter" scholar, teacher-education and curriculum scholar, classroom and school system scholar and elementary school child--perhaps to the same degree as these worlds had been brought together in the careers of the conference participants. English Institutes for secondary people have usually been institutes in which three courses, in language, literature, and composition, have been taught and usually by academic departments of English. The remainder of the institute has been given over to a workshop examination of the teaching implications of new subject matter knowledge and an examination of curriculum materials, and this remainder has been conducted under the guidance of a scholar in English education and perhaps some very professional secondary school teachers. This policy did not seem terribly appropriate for elementary institutes. What we came up with was a plan designed to put the distinguished and divided worlds back together.

## The Subject-Matter Scholar and The Child: The Experimental School:

The scholar in the academic department and the child have traditionally lived a long way apart, and, traditionally, they have spoken to one another through a series of middle men. The committees did not propose the Populist solution of eliminating middle men, but they did propose to put the scholar in the academic department and the child on speaking terms: to make them say "How do you do," and "How do you do" and "How do you do, again." This means that, in most reports, there is an insistence that the institute have the opportunity to go to children, to teach them, to try out new scholarship and new classroom ideas with them. And it was felt that it would not be a bad-idea if what Mickleburgh has called "senior scholars" were asked to do some teaching with children to try out their fancy hypotheses--if for no other purpose than to force them to keep their feet on the ground. Those who wish to know what these summer demonstration-clinical schools can be like at their most workable should perhaps write to Professor Rose Sabaroff of Elementary Education at the Harvard School of Education (where clinical-demonstration work of the kind proposed by the conference has been tried for a good while).

It was commonly, in this connection, recommended that the teachers in the institute be invited to be curriculum scholars to the degree required by requests that, on the basis of their study in the institute (and past study), they create lessons for the children of their own--

lessons based on the new scholarship which they have mastered in the institute. It was suggested that the teachers and scholars be encouraged to observe the new lesson and discuss its scholarly and psychological content in workshop sessions conducted as close to the time of teaching as possible. Thus, theory can be tried out in practice which can in turn be measured against and measure theory.

With the concern that the scholar and child be asked to meet in the institute went an equal concern to widen and to narrow the definition of the kind of English language "subject matter" scholar who might appropriately instruct in an Elementary English Language Arts Institute. The problem in its barest form may be represented by an exchange which took place in the Reading Committee: "Dr. Sustakoski felt that linguists were better able to speak for themselves and their field at institutes than were /their/ representatives and interpreters who might reduce the accumulated knowledge of linguists to an intellectual pablum; Professor Lefevre retorted that linguists themselves might add their own misinterpretations or might be equally misunderstood." The problem is a crucial one; on the one hand, while it is probable that a great many people in education have jumped for the bandwagons which are going for linguistic scholarship, communication theory, and various sorts of archetypal or structural literary criticism which might be significant for elementary English training, it is also probable that many advocates of the usefulness of an area are not also its masters. Conversely, it is equally obvious that a great many scholars who are masters of linguistics[1] or whatever know almost nothing about the elementary classroom, about children, *or* about elementary teachers and, moreover, that they habitually use a professional vocabulary calculated to assure teachers that what they have to say is both foolish and irrelevant to the elementary classroom. What is wanted then are people who are very professional as scholars, who speak and write and teach with clarity, who know the problems of elementary teachers and the look of a classroom and child.

Several suggestions were offered as to where such people might be found. It was not the inclination of the group to say that they *would* or *would not* be found either in English or Speech departments or Elementary Education departments. Obviously, the scholarly competence of the group speaking and the character of its interest in both the art of language and in children made that posture ridiculous. But the series of suggestions as to where the competence and clarity needed might be found concerned itself more with capacities and combinations than with niches: Mickleburgh speaks of teams of "[pupils, teachers], education specialists, specialists in Children's literature and advanced critics and scholars"; Allen speaks of "experienced [school] teachers who have had intensive training in linguistics"[2] and recommends also college scholars who do know elementary schools and [linguistics] professors in teacher training colleges who have worked with elementary school teachers; Brown speaks of the need for team teaching situations and for collaboration among departments of Speech, English, and Elementary education; the Language Committee follows Raven McDavid in supporting a staff made of "middle group people" who are in control of the most advanced scholarship and who are, yet, in touch with the schools; the Reading Committee pushes for the "scholar-teacher." What is important is that writers of institute proposals give evidence concerning both the scholarly competence and the knowledgeability about schools of the staff which they propose, and this evidence cannot be provided simply by lists of publication. It might partly be provided by *vita* lists which describe the person's experience and by recommendations from both advanced scholars and school people. Obviously in cases where the staff member's breadth of competence is well known, such materials would be unnecessary.

---

[1] I use linguistics here because it came up so often in the discussion.

[2] Allen also remarks, "Linguists who have never visited elementary school classes--or, at best, have had no contact with elementary school teachers would probably be among the worse resource persons for a language arts institute."

What I have said about staff thus far, I have applied only to teaching staff, but the same general rubrics should, more or less, apply to workshop leaders, demonstration teachers and so forth. If the staff of an institute does not form an intellectual community which is generally in the possession of a common body of scholarship and a common sense of the inscape of *this school* and *that child*, if the structure of the institute does not grow out of a common sense of the shape of the discipline, one doubts that the administrative subtlety of McNamara could make an institute amount to much. And with that goes the implication that the staff should be given opportunities for frequent scholarly discussion with one another and with teachers and should participate in and/or observe one another's activities in lecture, demonstration class, etc. The staffing of elementary English Language Arts Institutes will probably be a very expensive business.

The Teaching Design of the Institute:

In one area, I, as the secretary of the conference, made a tentative recommendation to the members of the conference and to the writers of the position papers--a recommendation which I also encouraged them to feel free to ignore:

> Since the (conference) groups are so organized as to assure a vigorous discussion, it will be useful if you /the writer of the position paper/ can organize your writing under "blocks" or units which you regard as important in a program: e. g. , dialects, literary forms, phonetics and clinical work (or whatever) etc. , etc. You must, of course, choose the blocks and describe them in the depth which you see as appropriate. Your using an organization according to suggested institute blocks will permit the discussion groups to analyze your remarks block by block and accept, reject, or modify in a systematic way. For instance, I would imagine that a dialects block would serve all five disciplines. I suspect that, as Bob Hogan recently suggested to me, any meaningful institute that strives to serve all five areas will have to include a number of "modular" blocks that provide central information relevant to the teaching of three to five of the areas with which we're concerned.

This format was not used by all writers of position papers; in some cases, I made the suggestion too late (Speech) and in some cases the subject did not easily lend itself to a "block" division (Literature). Owen Thomas urged a somewhat similar institute organization:

> Fundamental to each institute should be a course in the value of the system of language. Complementary to this, there should be . . . modules . . . which are concerned with the application of the system in various areas: speech, composition, drama, reading and so on. Not all participants in the institute would take all available modules; probably not all possible modules would be offered at each institute. But as each participant worked within a module, he would see how the theoretical basis of that module was the same as for every other module. He would also begin to see how the modules interact, how--in fact--it is possible to instruct children in several "arts" at the same time.

Essentially I think that the conference bought this package with the reservations that space be allowed both for analytic and for the contemplative approaches to language and its arts, and with the provision that what is said in the "module" be tried in the institute in classrooms and with children.

If we were to ask the subject-matter question of the conference, it would read: "What must elementary teachers know about the English language if they are to teach its widest resources to children in any meaningful way?" The "must" was put in because we wished to observe a doctrine of thrift--not wishing either necessarily to advocate the destruction of the self-contained classroom (though that position did find some support at the conference) and not wishing to commit the elementary teacher to a decade of "retraining" in language to be followed by equally long periods of retraining in the social sciences and in mathematics and the natural sciences. It may well be that this conference is the first gong of the knell of the self-contained classroom in the sense that its deliberations dramatize the tremendous weight of scholarship and professional skill which ought to go with the elementary teacher into the classroom. The conference preferred not to hear this sound--if it was a sound--and preferred to assume that great knowledge could be got in short compass, that America's teachers of elementary self-enclosed classrooms would generally be kept part of the scholarly community, despite the rapidity of scholarly and curricular change, through teaching programs for them which seize on the essential, the basic structures--as a Bruneresque psychologist would define them--which are presumably both the structures which elementary teachers must know and which they must directly or indirectly represent to children. Still the burden is great.

The other elements in the question must also be defined: by the English language was meant the language as a system among systems of communication and its full resources for allowing man to speak to man. This meant that every committee directly or indirectly specified that a core block or series of blocks in the training program should be a high-level course in linguistics and the system (or systems) whereby we communicate.

The group did not ignore the matter covered by the phrases "if they are to teach to children." Here what is envisaged is a perhaps less imposing block or group of blocks concerned with society and the individual and what Ortega has called "the socializing of the individual through the process of assimilating the structure of language." The fields which might contribute to such a block would be the fields which relate sociology and linguistics and those which relate psychology and linguistics. This block might also include introduction to what knowledge we have as to how children learn logical and imaginative constructs in various societies and social groupings--a study which could inform the teacher's understanding of curricula which ask that children discover intellectual principles for themselves, as well as inform the study of literature for children and composition study designed for children.

The third area may be defined by the phrase: "And its widest possible resources." Here I think that study must generally be turned from what I have called the systematic and analytic to what I have called the structured and contemplative. Obviously one does not teach to children what the culture already teaches--what they learn merely by being alive--although one may teach them to be self-conscious in their understanding of popular genres of artistic and discursive expression. Education must carry children beyond what they would acquire if they were in the street. What was meant by the widest possible resources was (a) the deepening of the understanding of popular communication and culture; (b) the broadening of the knowledge and the deepening of the understanding of those discursive and imaginative resources of the language which are not popular or automatically acquired; and, possibly (c) the deepening of the understanding of what children can do with the "non-popular, non-automatic" linguistic resources. And in this area would come a study of a series of "kinds" or forms of discursive and fictive writing[1] and the logical and symbolic resources which commonly enter into such writing.[2] This then would suggest three central teaching blocks: (1) language and systems of communication per se; (2) language as learned by children and taught by "society"; and (3) special imaginative and discursive uses of language. Now to detail.

## The Central Blocks:[3]

If the three central blocks concern (1) language as a system; (2) the interaction between the individual child and his society in the learning of linguistic systems and their uses; and (3) the imaginative and discursive uses of language for children and adults, they would appear to need to contain the following information:

### 1.0 Language as a system:

1.01 The history of the development of English: The language block should probably include some attention to the history of the development of English including attention to the shift from reliance on the inflectional to reliance on the syntactic as "central" in the grammar of the language (as Old English forms are replaced by Middle English ones); and, with this, could go a description of the impact of the Norman invasion upon linguistic history; of shifts in the phonological and graphemic structure of the language which are particularly relevant to the understanding of reading; and of dialectal-regional variation in the Old and Middle English period as those bear on dialect and usage variation in modern America, particularly variations found in what are popularly called substandard dialects. This unit, like a number of the language units, could perhaps be done through crash teaching with films, special publications, consultants, as well as text materials.

---

[1] I use the word "fictive" generally in the sense in which Macrobius uses the phrase "narratio fabulosa."

[2] By symbolic, we also mean what modern critics mean when they speak of "mythic" or "iconological" elements, and, by resources, we mean something akin to "elements" and "operations."

[3] The following analysis of what might go into an institute is drawn from an inventory of all of the position papers and committee reports; it is an effort to see what specific common job of work they point to; but it may be that Martial's epigram to Fedentius should be applied to what I have done to the work of the committees.

1.02 The history of writing systems: The institute should also glance, at least in a cursory fashion, at the history of writing systems, at their variety, and the special strengths and weaknesses of the various forms of writing correlative with the spoken language. A historical block would lead to the study of the modern writing as it represents (or is) the language--this study relevant to reading, language and composition.

1.03 The history of language study: The committees generally urged a study of the history of language study along with the study of the history of the language, and some committees suggested that the survey go back as far as Greco-Roman analyses and include (1) "Lowthian" 18th century systems which derive from these; (2) the great philological and lexicographical systems of the pre-Bloomfieldians; and (3) post-Bloomfieldian systems, particularly structural, transformational, and tagmemic approaches. (One of these "ways of looking" would presumably underlie the whole block's description of linguistic system and would, for instance, determine whether phonology, morphology and syntax were studied as separate subjects, whether morphology and phonology were grouped together as "morphophonemics," or whether morphology and syntax were joined.)

1.04 The history and communication systems: The block could give a brief history of systems of communication (symbol systems) collateral with English--a matter recommended by the Speech committee.

1.10 The physiology of sound and language: The committees generally recommended that some attention be given to the study of the physiology of language, of speaking and hearing, to the study of the physiology of simple speaking or hearing disorders, and to the basic principles of acoustic and articulatory phonetics.

1.11 Phonology: The study of the physiology of speech and hearing per se can in turn be extended into a study of sound insofar as it "says something," insofar as it is part of the describable "grammar" of the language; here the system for describing "grammatically effective" sound differentiation may or may not require a concomitant attention to grammatically effective word forms (morphophonemics) depending on the kind of analysis of language chosen for the institute. With the study of grammatically effective sound at the segmental level can also go an attention to intonation patterns and to prosody--and, with the study of intonation, of such punctuation conventions as pattern with the melody of the language. Likewise, any institute which plans a serious reading module must attend to the relationale of the alphabetic writing system, to the degree to which it may be seen as more or less coordinate with sound and intonation patterns of the language or with patterns of sound, word form, dialect, and so forth (phonemics-graphemics, graphemics-morphonemics, morphophone study, etc.). No one should expect this study in the central block to unlock all reading or to point to any reading system; it may, perhaps, give the teacher the information available from linguistic researches which will assist her understanding of what goes into reading.

1.12 Morphology: Obviously particularly important as a separate study if the approach to system is an approach rather closely derived from Bloomfield's work.

1.13 Syntax: The study of syntax may be undertaken simply or together with the study of morphology--particularly in institutes which do not depend on Mr. Chomsky's work but rather on the work of the followers of Bloomfield or of Pike. With this may also go some attention to the relationship between syntactic structures common in speaking and those rare in speaking but common in writing--in adult writing or adult professional writing (relevant to reading, speech, composition). The study of syntax may also, in some institutes, be extended into the study of syntactic interdependence between sentences--whatever bearing linguists may see this as having upon the way in which we put together paragraphs.

1.14 Meaning: None of the committees went very deeply into the question of "how a work or a sentence means"--but all wanted the institute to deal with the question of meaning and its analysis; questions of "semantics," connotation, logic--these all came up. Perhaps no area needs more attention or has less material which is philosophically rigorous and relevant or available to the elementary teacher. If one can ask how a work or a sentence means, one can ask when it is meaningless--surely a question which ought to concern us when we try to deal with children.[1]

1.2 Dialects and Usage: Pretty obviously much of our elementary language education is dying of thirst for some really solid knowledge about dialects and usage not only as it may enable the teacher to understand the sound patterns, usage, word choice, and grammar used by his children but also insofar as it may enable him to choose how he will teach this or that child and what (cf. 1.01).

---

[1] Here I am indulging in a bit of special pleading which goes beyond the explicit statements of the committees.

1.3 Dictionaries: Their making and function (cf. 1.02): The controversy over the Third International should make the need for this kind of study obvious.

2.0 The Learning of Language: This section should include some general discussions of the nature of linguistic competence and of its effects on the child's capacity to influence his environment.

2.10 Physiology and Learning: The physiological matters which bear on a child's learning of language: the reading and speech committees were particularly concerned with these matters (should pair with 1.10).

2.12 The Learning of Sounds and Grammar: The stages according to which children appear normally to acquire a grammar: this section of the study should concern itself with studies in the acquisition of control over the sound-grammar of the language (phonemics, intonation, rhythm), its morphology and its syntax--as these matters are discussed in studies by such persons as John Carroll, Ruth Hirsch Weir, Ruth Strickland, Walter Loban, and by a number of members of the conference--particularly members of the Speech Committee. The analysis of this problem as it relates to written syntax is being done by Kellogg Hunt, Eldonna Evertts, and others. This analysis of stages in the acquisition of phonological, morphological and grammatical structures should be correlated with 1.11, 1.12, and 1.13. Relevant to reading, language, speech, and composition.[1]

2.14 The Learning of Vocabulary: The stages according to which children acquire a vocabulary and, with this, the development of their sense of the relationships between words and things, their sense of imaginative and logical relationships: the kind of matter studied by Piaget, Hunt, Brown, and so forth. This unit should be correlated with 1.14 and should be useful to study in all of the language areas (Reading, Speech, Language) as well as to Literature and Composition.

2.15 The Individual and Language Learning: The relationship to language learning of intelligence and of a variety of personal emotional and physical factions: the function of language learning for the child: feedback, etc. The realm of the creative: psychological and social factors which seem to make a child more a free being, more able to manipulate the syntactic, logical or imaginative structures provided by school and society to enable him to speak his piece to the world.

---

[1] The discovery of staff competent in these areas will be particularly difficult.

2.2 The Press of Culture Upon Language Learning: Cultural variation as it affects language learning not only in the area of dialect but in the areas of the formation of a vocabulary, of an "imaginative" world and of a conceptual scheme--as it affects the child's capacity to get what he wants from the world to which he speaks (correlative with 1.2).

3.00 Imaginative and Discursive Uses of Language:

3.01 Oral-literature and Oral Discursive Situations: Oral formulaic literature, children's oral storytelling; oral discursive situations and the speaker-audience relationship in the oral context.

3.02 Written literature and "written discursive" situations: The special artist-audience "communication" problems raised for children and for adults by the fact of writing: the disappearance of the personal presence: the persona, point of view, etc. (It is assumed that linguistic-rhetorical matters having to do with sentences and smaller units of language separating "oral" from "written" situations would be treated in the language sequence of the course.)

3.03 The conception of genre or "systematic structure" in discursive and literary writing: The section might include some analysis of the idea of "discourse structure"; it should also deal with the concept of similar structure--conventional generic structure or mythic structure--in a work of imagination. With this might go some analysis of generic models: from report models to fables, etc.

3.04 The central mythos of Western writing and related central literary structures: Study of original texts setting forth the central Biblical eidola, Greek eidola; epic; tragedy, and its modes; comedy and its modes; the use of oral or "oral-formulaic" myths of the region; the figural dimensions of writing--allegory, symbolism, archetype--in the above modes. The work done in this section should correlate with 1.14, 2.14, and 2.15, and some attention to poetic structure would be appropriate here though one would expect prosody and the structure which it imposes to be treated with phonology. With this study might also go literary-critical examination of children's writing depending more or less on the myths and modes described above (cf. Mickleburgh); and with the study of tragedy and comedy might go a study of the literary-oral artifice of drama and of children's creative drama.

## Timing and The Core Block of Instruction:

It may seem that the units of study described above are too ambitious for a program of institutes of one summer's duration; perhaps we need two summers or a year. "But always at my back I hear the sound of motorbuses and horns which bring Sweeney to Mrs. Ignorance in the spring." Most of the committees appeared to urge that the core blocks be programs of saturation training. It appears to me that programs of saturation training carefully devised could do segments I & II, the analytic side of the analysis of linguistic structure and language learning, in 4-6 weeks; segment III (Imaginative and Discursive Uses of Language) could perhaps be done in another four weeks if some such package as the following were tried:

| Language | | | | Supporting Modules |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| History of the development of English; of Western writing systems, language study and analogous symbol systems | Study of one grammatical model (phonology-morphology-syntax) and of its picture of language | Study of conventions of dialect and usage. | Study of lexicon, meaning, logical uses of language | A. Speech<br>B. Reading<br>C. Language<br>D. Composition: the rhetoric of the smaller units |
| | II LANGUAGE LEARNING | | | |
| | The stages in the acquisition of a sound system and grammar | Study of the influence of culture on the child's language learning | Study of the cognitive development of the child | |
| Week I<br>No Workshop | Weeks II, III, IV<br>Workshop and demonstration classes | Week V<br>Workshop and demonstration classes | Week VI<br>Workshop in supporting modules; demonstration work; clinical classes | |

A four or five week institute would obviously have to present a very condensed picture of grammar and grammatical analysis. If a 4-5 week institute in language and language-learning could be continued for, say, 3-4 weeks more, it might be possible to include Block III in the same institute. Block III deals, in the main, with what I have called contemplative (or generic-rhetorical) approaches to the system of language and centers on the creative element in the exploring of the total resources of the language.

| | Week V | Weeks VI-IX | Supporting Modules |
|---|---|---|---|
| I | Oral-oral literature and oral discursive situations | Genres and myths: the imaginative structure of western literature and writing for children | Literature for children<br>Speech: story telling, oral composition, creative drama |
| II | The writing situation: Writer-audience relations and situations | Mythos<br>epic<br>comedy-romance<br>tragedy<br>allegory<br>symbolism<br>archetype<br>poetry | Composition: fictional and non-fictional larger units |
| III | The concept of genre in discursive and fictive writing | | Reading: the literary-reading program |
| | No Workshop | Workshop, seminar, and demonstration classes | |

Clearly the greatest pressure will come in the area of the unit on "genres and myths" since it requires a heavy dose of serious reading in the great humane literature of the West and not training in such a system of analysis or such a series of perceptions as can be handled easily in a program of saturation training. It may be possible to have teachers read the larger works to be studied before they come to the institute so that the institute will allow quicker rereading. It may be possible to space component III as a single workshop course across a whole year--an on-the-spot course for teachers (though this would require that the institute accept teachers from the area). It might be possible to make component III into Part II of a two summer institute or the second semester of a year-long program. And with this should go substantial workshops and individual work with writing and with preparing lessons--all of this in an atmosphere which builds the teacher's confidence in her own scholarly and "creative" abilities; such work is described particularly well in the suggestions of the position papers and of the committee reports dealing with literature and composition.

## Supporting Modules:

It is not the place of this introduction to describe in detail what ought to go into the supporting modules since the reports of the individual committees speak for themselves and require no pulling together. It would appear that into the reading module should go the matters which Mr. Iverson discusses in turning from theory to practice (readiness, word identification, comprehension, instructional procedures and arrangements, materials, and devices, and evaluation) and those which the Reading Committee discusses under "Methodology of Reading Instruction"; the language "module," if one exists, should go into the matters discussed under basic skills and creativity, in the Language Committee report; since the central blocks deal intensively with language and language learning, a supporting module concerning "language applications" may be perfunctory. The speech module should probably go into the matters discussed under the heading "Principles and Skills Required of the Classroom Teacher" in the Speech report, and the Composition module should work in conference with teacher's writing (and children's writing as Mrs. Saunders suggests and as the descriptions of the colloquium in the same report suggest). Not only should the literature module do what Mickleburgh and the literature committee suggest be done in workshop and demonstration, but the literature module, as suggested in these two statements, may form a model for work in every other area.

In every case, the supporting module should require that the participant prepare to try out new materials--new lessons which he has found in new curriculum materials or preferably written for himself; these materials and his teaching act should bring together his new knowledge about the subject, about psychology, and about style in teaching. At a number of points in the institute, the participant should be able to make children his scholarly colleagues in the pursuit of new knowledge. As Owen Thomas suggests, some institutes will wish to suggest that teachers work in one supporting module--some in three, four or five. Certainly the work should not be so thin as to be worthless, but, if the institute has as many as five supporting modules and each participant works in but one, then opportunities for frequest discussion between groups should be provided. Certainly all persons who teach or discuss or whatever in the supporting module should attend all "block" teaching sessions and most demonstration sessions. What is done in "core block," in "supporting module," and in lessons prepared for the clinical classes should be as root and branch of a single scholarly concern.

## Materials:

Not only will the location of staff for the blocks be difficult. Intensive training of the kind proposed here assumes the preparation of fuller, more carefully worked out syllabi than can be found in this introduction or in the reports which follow. The methods according to which such syllabi might be prepared are various, and one need not spell them out here. However, it may be appropriate to suggest the need for brief, lucid, and profound summaries of the knowledge available in the areas indicated in blocks I, II and III and in the supporting modules. It would also be useful if bibliographies such as that included by the language committee would be prepared for every area, if source books of outstanding and lucid essays in the various fields were prepared, and if professional groups would prepare lists of consultants particularly well qualified to serve institutes in various ways.

Summary:

What the conference said, I think, is simple and obvious. It said that we are not, in working out the training of teachers, simply dealing with a retraining job. We are dealing with a reshuffling job; it said that we cannot assume that educators can work at retraining apart from working in clinical schools where children are educated, that scholars cannot exist apart from the schools. It said that the language curriculum can no longer be fragmented at its center. It said that the study of language as it hits the child--its structure, its learning, and the picture of the world rendered by its imaginative or logical models--is the center of our business, that this is one business; finally, the conference said that all of what we do must ask that scholars, teachers, and children form a single intellectual community working at discovering what the structure of the dialect of the tribe is.

This pursuit of the question of what language is and how it is learned is as old as philosophy; Augustine, in the Confessions reminds us of the antiquity of the conference's concerns:

> When they (my elders) named some object, and accordingly moved toward something, I saw them and I grasped that the thing was called by the sound they uttered when they meant to point it out. Their intention was shown by their bodily movements, as it were the natural language of all peoples: the expression of the face, the play of the eyes, the movement of other parts of the body, and the tone of voice which expresses our state of mind in seeking, having, rejecting, or avoiding something. Thus, as I heard words repeatedly used in their proper places in various sentences, I gradually learnt to understand what objects they signified; and after I had trained my mouth to form these signs, I used them to express my own desires.

And Wittgenstein, on the passage from Augustine, reminds us that the job remains new:

> Augustine, we might say, does describe a system of communication, only not everything that we call language is this system. And one has to say this in many cases, where the question arises "Is this an appropriate description or not?" The answer is "Yes, it is appropriate, but only for this narrowly circumscribed region, not for the whole of what you were claiming to describe." (Investigations, I, 3)

One may appropriately ask the same question of this document's description of language, language training, linguistic usages--as these carry implications for speaking with teachers. And one could appropriately give the same answer: "Yes, it is appropriate, but only for a narrowly circumscribed region."

# Reading in the English Language Arts Institute

William Iverson
Associate Dean of Stanford School of Education
Stanford, California

I have just gone through the humbling experience of helping prepare for Educational Testing Service an examination designed for specialists in beginning reading. I found I had to be extremely careful about what the right answers were. The experience reinforced an earlier chastening time in 1952 which I spent with the late Professor William S. Gray. As a post-doctoral fellow I had gone to the University of Chicago to review the most complete library on research in reading then available. I had gone to resolve my uncertainties. Under his compassionate guidance I found that I had to retain my uncertainties. I was able to refine them but not to purge them.

Both experiences find a rough analogy in the request I received this month to present this position paper on reading. The reading test, for various reasons, had to be done with great haste. The sojourn with Professor Gray had to be undertaken with minimum forethought. This paper has had to be composed without the time for extended reflection which it deserved. My fondest hope is that uncertainties be further refined--perhaps some even purged.

At the suggestion of Paul Olson, I will try first to carve out some large blocks which surely must have attention in any institute designed to give teachers perspective on the English language arts in the elementary school. Each of the blocks is of general relevance to the whole of the language arts program; each is also of import to the reading component of the program. The central block must include: the English language, the development of facility in the English language in children, the desired ends of English instruction in the elementary school, the kinds of knowledge and competences needed by teachers to secure those ends of instruction.

I would think that the most important block of instruction in the institute ought to be devoted to a study of the English language. It is certainly clear that elementary teachers, with rare exceptions, do not know in any depth how their native tongue has developed over the centuries. They are not fully apprised of its functioning today. Professor Fries, as long ago as the twenties, said in his book on language that a teacher ought to know what the long term trends of language development were. It is even clearer now that teachers need this perspective at the very least to avoid Quixotian battle on grounds long since conceded. For example, in reading instruction teachers ought to know that the anonymity of the vowel in the unaccented syllable, the schwa sound, has developed over some seven centuries at least. Any work on orthography in relation to sound under the rubric of phonics, spelling pattern, or whatever term is preferred, must take realistic cognizance of that fact of historical development. Similarly a clear sense of the functioning of the English language today has obvious relevance for the teacher of reading. The Committee on Linguistics and Reading, of which one of our conferees, Professor Tyler, is chairman, has noted six areas of relationship:

1. The Study of the Writing System: The Beginning Reader

2. Syntax, a Broad Basis for Reading Comprehension

3. The Grammar of Rhythm and Melody as Related to Reading

4. Wording and Meaning

5. The Subgroup Dialect in Speaking and the Standard Dialect in Reading

6. Reading as a Part of Knowing Language and Literature

As the Committee says, "Linguistics helps the reader read better, then, because linguistic study helps him to understand better the orders of language: its writing system, its grammar, intonation, lexicon, and its relationship with other dialects and with other languages." (Unpublished document, Committee on Linguistics and Reading, NCTE and IRA, 1964.)

This study of language ought to form a central block from which all the language arts draw support. Speaking, listening, writing obviously can make applications similar to those indicated for reading. Wherever else we may differ surely we can all agree that the greatest single resource for improvement in elementary English instruction is to be found in a heightened awareness by teachers and their students of the workings of their native language.

Bruner in his new book, *Toward a Theory of Instruction,* speaks of language as a "tool of the most general sort" and remarks "that discovery how to make something comprehensible to the young is only a culmination of making something comprehensible to ourselves in the first place--that understanding and aiding others to understand are both of a piece." (Excerpt published in *Saturday Review,* 49:71, February 19, 1966.) So, perhaps, if we can clarify what historical and current linguistic knowledge belongs in these institutes and, in turn, communicate that knowledge to teachers, we may have some grounds for optimism about the benefits to be gained by children.

The second block of instruction of central importance to all the language arts should concern itself with how this linguistic system is mastered by children. Here teachers need to know something of the physiological, the psychological, the cultural--and of their interplay with the system. Again, it is my impression that elementary teachers do not know enough about these matters to make a difference in the way they conduct language instruction.

We all agree, for example, that speech is the basic form of any living language. Yet only the teacher especially trained, in a speech department or elsewhere, is likely to know very much about how the sounds of the language are produced. If teachers are to use effectively in reading instruction such a linguistic principle as that of minimum contrast (between a voiced and a voiceless phoneme, for example) some elementary knowledge of the physiology of language appears necessary. Such knowledge seems especially critical in order to teach with neither overdirection nor underdirection the child with a markedly substandard dialect or from another language background. Sapir said in the twenties that in those whose language background is other than native the view that "aside from a few striking differences . . . the sounds they use are the same as those they are familiar with . . . (is) . . . naive . . . largely illusory . . ." (Edward Sapir, *Language*, Harcourt, 1921, p. 44).

Or to take an example from the psychology of language, how many elementary teachers would understand what Nelson Brooks was discussing when he said, " . . . the mind of the child far from being a *tabula rasa* which passively receives the language [patterns] of the community as they are impressed upon it, is rather an active agent with a prodigious capacity for *parole*, and it is the interaction of his *parole* with the *langue* of the community as represented in the behavior of those around him that first leads him to the use of language symbolization." (Nelson Brooks, *Language and Language Learning*, Harcourt, 1960, pp. 36-50.) Of course, we do not want to burden teachers with technical details but certainly somewhat greater sophistication about the psychology of language is desirable. One of the fields of psychology growing at an accelerating pace is that concerned with verbal behavior. We need to begin making more explicit the bridge between psycholinguistics and elementary school language instruction.

Finally, there is the whole realm of cultural press on language. We must help elementary teachers know more about the kind of problem which concerns Bruner when he says:

> The importance of early experience is only dimly sensed today. . .In the last few years there have been reports showing the crippling effects of deprived human environments,

> as well as indications that 'replacement therapies' can be of considerable success, even at an age on the edge of adolescence. The principal deficits appear to be linguistic in the broadest sense--the lack of opportunity to share in dialogue, to have occasion for paraphrase, to internalize speech as a vehicle of thought . . . In time, and with sufficient failure, the gap is reinforced to irreversibility by a sense of defect. (Excerpt from "Toward a Theory of Instruction," Saturday Review, 49:73, February 19, 1966.)

At this juncture, I may need to say that I do have in mind an eight weeks institute and that I do realize how much I am asking. It is true that in these two blocks alone there is substance for a curriculum much longer than eight weeks and we have not even begun to speak of the particularities of reading instruction. Yet I also am convinced that without these central blocks--and two others of which I will speak briefly--the whole institute has no foundation, however long or short it is.

One of the two central blocks remaining on my construct for the institute is devoted to an overview of the whole English language arts program in the elementary school. Unless we can communicate more successfully than we have in the past the essential integrity of good English instruction we will continue to have weak programs. We can never have the best reading instruction without its being taught integrally with speaking and listening and writing. And the converse, of course, is equally true. We can never have the best writing or the best speaking or the best listening unless they are of a piece with the reading program. We must show in the institute how to obtain this essential mutual reinforcement. Without this cyclical interchange among the language arts we will continue to have the kind of program exemplified in word analysis in reading unrelated to spelling which is in turn unrelated to writing. As Hans Guth says, "The subject matter of English is not an accidental accumulation of more or less remotely related areas of interest. It is unified by its concern with the workings of language--its purposes, functions, and effects. To counteract the effects of specialization and fragmentation, English teachers must define their discipline in such a way as to stress this underlying unity." (Hans Guth, English Today and Tomorrow, Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 5.)

The last central block on my agenda for the institute concerns the kinds of competence teachers ought to strive to attain if they are to succeed in language instruction. I realize those who come to the institute are mature and have completed a program of preparation for teaching. But it is my impression that while the preparation of high school English teachers leaves much to be desired (the recent survey of the National Council of Teachers of English made that statement irrefutable), the preparation of elementary English teachers is even weaker. I think we must extend the preparation of elementary teachers considerably or we must make some kind of teaching arrangements whereby we restrict the number of disciplines they are expected to teach. Meanwhile we owe it to the teacher attending these institutes to try to stimulate enough enthusiasm so that after they leave the institutes they will want to extend their preparation on their own. Are they unaware of fine poetry for children? Let them begin to read it now. Have they never written a line since their student days? Let them struggle to compose. Do they not know the art of story-telling? Let them learn the high joy of children caught in a tale well told. A kind of individual study program tailored to each institute member ought to make possible a beginning toward extension of competence. One of the key criteria of the success or failure of the institute must be that the teachers are determined to learn more of the great heritage of English and to bring their continuing education to the service of children.

Now there are obviously other central blocks of instruction in the institute for which an equally strong case can be made. I will content myself with these four: language, language development in children, the ends desired in language arts instruction, and the extension of teaching competences needed to secure those ends. And I will turn now to the particulars of reading instruction.

First, I think a clear understanding of what we know about the reading process ought to be developed. We can draw on the central blocks we have just discussed. We know reading is a language process. We ought to show concretely the relationships to linguistics such as those previously listed from the Committee on Linguistics and Reading. We know reading is a physiological process. We ought to demonstrate explicitly that reading is not primarily resident in the eyes. As Carl Lefevre, another of our conferees, has said, it is not an eye-directed enterprise but a "language-directed" enterprise. We know reading is a psychological process. We ought to explain something of the complexity of the forces playing upon perception. We particularly need to expand teachers' view of the process as a rather narrow, mechanical act, principally word recognition. Thorndike's old notion that reading is not distinguishable from thinking of the so-called "higher sort" is still relevant as is his idea that "the mind is assailed by every word in the paragraph. It must select, repress, soften, emphasize, correlate and organize all under the influence of the right mental set or purpose or demand." (Quoted in Hunnicutt and Iverson, Research in the Three R's, Harper, 1958.) If we could add Lefevre's concept of language-direction to Thorndike's thinking-direction to the working ideas of elementary teachers about reading, we might modify classroom practice considerably, and profitably. We also know that reading is a cultural process. In the general block on language the institute teachers would see that language and culture are inextricably intertwined. In this section on reading we would want to focus those general understandings. What part does reading play in the various subcultures out of which children issue? What kind of language liaison with the subculture is needed in the text? What kind of changes in content are indicated? What are the cultural extensions and reinforcements children need in order to pursue reading with vigor and satisfaction? We are beginning cautiously to take reading instruction out of its middle class myopia but we have not fully embraced the rich cultural diversity which is America. We must help our institute clients to see that reading cannot be taught with full effectiveness in one culture province and one only. In the thirties and forties Waples and others used to discuss the sociology of reading. We need to revive that discourse in these institutes.

With this extended attention to process you may wonder if we will ever get to practical procedure. I think myself, despite the frequent findings of surveys that courses in reading pedagogy are "too theoretical," that what we need is better theory explicitly related to instructional materials and procedures. If we do not relate principle to practice in these institutes we will achieve what many a teacher's manual now succeeds in developing: complete dependence on Big Brother.

But now let me turn to practice. The institutes must perforce discuss readiness, word identification, comprehension, instructional procedures and arrangements, materials and devices, and evaluation. I cannot do much more than state a position. The defense will have to come out of our discussions.

First, readiness. I do not intend to get into the argument about when reading instruction should begin. I believe it is primarily a value judgment for an individual child, given some linguistic facility reinforced by appropriate physiological, psychological and cultural supports. I do believe we ought to be at that level of sophistication about reading instruction so that we do not have to generate a smoke screen around our beginnings. It is, of course, true that whatever affects any kind of learning affects reading instruction. So when I began to teach reading courses, longer ago than I care to remember, I had a list as long as both your arms about all the factors in reading readiness. But I have gradually come to a doctrine of parsimony. I would try to limit the discussion of the institute participants to those factors especially critical in beginning reading. I see these as: linguistic, visual, intellectual. I would subsume general cultural considerations under the linguistic, general physiological considerations under the intellectual. I want badly to maintain a high degree of focus to add strength directly to what the child must do in order to read.

The first dictum I would issue as a preamble to discussing linguistic, visual and intellectual supports for reading is that there are children who are eminently ready to read without any formal training. In that case, I would just praise the Lord and pass the books. The second dogma to which I would give my allegiance is that any child who does need some instruction in getting ready to read also needs some differential in preparation. I find it difficult to defend running all children willy-nilly through the same maze. My third credo I take from the Book of Thoreau:

> Why should we be in such desperate trade to succeed, and in such desperate enterprises? If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away. (*Walden*, XVIII)

That does not mean I am simply a "waiter" in readiness, lingering for some Rousseauian "matural" evolvement. It does mean that, while I believe in working at readiness, I do not expect uniform progress toward reading.

Now then I would discuss the three factors I see as central to readiness. I think linguistic readiness is best described by Fries: if the child can understand talk about, and can himself talk about, his immediate experience, linguistically he is ready to read. We need some guides about criterion levels of adequacy but surely those could be defined. If it is true, that operational command of the language is achieved by the median level child at about school entry time, as many linguists assert, we ought to be able to specify what the command entails. Some youngsters from linguistically deprived circumstances clearly would need nourishment. We ought to try to say what the nourishment should include. (See Ursula Bellugi and Roger Brown, eds., *The Acquisition of Language. Report of the Fourth Conference Sponsored by the Committee on Intellectual Processes Research of the Social Sciences Research Council,* University of Chicago Press, 1964.)

I think visual readiness ought to begin at the optimum level, and retreat for a given child only so far as it is clearly mandatory. The progression commonly followed appears to move from objects to pictures of objects to designs (often geometrical) to letters. Not all children profit from this progression. If children can begin at the optimum level, obviously they should. I would define optimum level as ability to discriminate among the letters and among the spelling patterns. Professor Fries has some hunches about what these discriminations include and how to facilitate their development. (See *Linguistics and Reading*, Holt, 1963.) Professor Gibson of the psycholinguistic group at Cornell University has also made a promising beginning in determining these discriminations through carefully controlled research. (See A Basic Research Program on Reading, Cooperative Research Project No. 639, Cornell University, 1963.) Some youngsters, of course, cannot proceed at this optimum level. We need to help teachers know more about the forces playing upon perception which may be interfering. I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that retreat through the commonly-followed progression is not uniformly profitable. The more I look at the progression the more vulnerable it appears. So at the very least I believe we must ask teachers not to regard this progression as inevitably necessary. (We might alert them to the work of Kephart and Frostig as offering other avenues for those with perceptual difficulties.)

Discussion of intellectual factors in readiness ought to begin with the realization that they are not so potent at the beginning of reading instruction as they will become. (See Bond and Tinker, Reading Difficulties, Appleton, 1957, p. 42.) Similarly the limitations of group survey instruments especially with young children ought to be stressed. We do not want to perpetuate the stereotype of, "Look at his IQ. What can you expect?" We ought to acknowledge that along with intellectual factors a host of other psychological considerations may enter into readiness but I do not think we ought to repeat all the psychology courses our clients have ever had.

I defer evaluation of readiness to the general discussion of evaluation to be included later in this paper. But I had better say, in passing, that the appraisal guides for readiness appear vulnerable indeed. Professor John Carroll of Harvard almost dismisses present instruments entirely. I am not ready to go that far but I must say that his judgment has made me considerably more tentative about our ability to predict.

I proceed now to beginning reading instruction. And I turn first to word identification. Let us take the commonly followed clues in this order: pictorial, context, configuration, structure, phonic. At least with respect to identifying words the pictorial clue has always been hazardous. I believe we should stress this point with our institute members. Neither a picture with many objects nor even a picture with a single object can be related infallibly to a word. If it is a picture with a number of objects represented, the most ingenious pictorial composition will not inevitably focus the reader's attention on that object with which we wish him to associate a word. If it is a single object picture, he may call the object by a different name than that actually proffered in the text. (See Anderson and Dearborn, The Psychology of Teaching Reading, Ronald, 1952, pp. 151-152.) And, of course, many words are not easily pictured anyway (the function or marker words, such as in, this, or is, for example). We ought to be honest enough to admit that in typical beginning reading texts the picture serves mostly to flesh out the bare bones of the discourse.

The context clue is also perilous to the unwary. I am, in general, sympathetic to Professor Lefevre's position that the sentence brings meaning to the word. But I am forced to concede that the sentences I find in beginning texts do not have much meaning to bring. So that I should think that we would want to suggest that context becomes more useful in word identification as the text becomes more substantive. I would hope also that the institutes would stress that this clue is never serviceable if it connotes to the young reader a random stab at identification, a "guess." If the text does not yield identification by a systematic "thinking through" of the content of the discourse, the reader ought to be trained to look to other clues. Professor McCullough suggests some categories for this "thinking through" which I think are very promising as guides to instruction. (See Strang, McCullough and Traxler, The Improvement of Reading, McGraw-Hill, 1961, pp. 126-128.)

Configuration is another clue not without attendant danger. Viewed as purely visual entities, the profiles of words resist systematic response. (See Dechant, Improving the Teaching of Reading, Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 183-188.) Perhaps we would be on the most tenable ground if we were to emphasize that, as an access to new words, we regard configurations as a means of establishing quickly with beginners a reading vocabulary swiftly identified. In turn, this vocabulary permits confronting beginners with sentences with at least some semantic attractiveness. At the same time we begin teaching the long-term accesses to words which offer reliable, systematic approaches whenever a new word is met. If we exclude the dictionary, the avenues which appear to be thus replicatable are context, structure, and phonics. Configuration would, then, not be thought of as a long-term access to new words, though we would admit that the more familiar words become to a reader the more he may store them for quick retrieval upon minimum presentation of clues.

Now we are upon the two most reliable and systematic approaches to words: structure and phonics. (I have listed context as another reliable and systematic access but, even in the most substantive discourse, I believe it must take second chair in the instrumentation of word attack.) I would have no serious quarrel with treating these two kinds of clues as one. Traditionally in reading pedagogy we have treated them separately.

If we restrict structure to pieces with a clear semantic burden, in other words if we make this morphemic analysis, we probably avoid argument. Clearly it is an aid to a reader to be able to bring to his word analysis a sense of prefixes, roots, suffixes, inflections.

It is when we try to make a case for conventional syllabication as an aid to identification that disagreements arise. It has not been possible to identify the syllable securely either in sound or in orthography. (See Haugen, "The Syllable in Linguistic Description," in For Roman Jakobson, Mouton, 1956, pp. 213-221.) I would suggest that we relieve our institute members of the burden of teaching syllabication boundaries and concentrate instead on the meaning "chunks" already listed.

If we now turn to phonics, we enter a tourney of joyous jousting indeed. The essential sources of disagreement appear to be these:

1. Should letters be assigned clearly isolatable sound values and words built up by the reader synthetically?
2. Should words be approached analytically and the sound values of the separate letters be ascertained within these words?
3. Should words be approached analytically and the sound values of the separate letters ascertained within these words, but should the pace be quickened markedly?
4. Should words be approached analytically and the sound values of the separate letters be ascertained within these words, but should the initial words be chosen for phonemic regularity?
5. Should letters be associated always in spelling patterns and employed analytically within phonemically regular words?
6. Whatever proposal is accepted, what sequence in teaching the grapheme-phoneme relationships should be followed?

I think we must say to institute clients that we need better evidence that we now have to choose without doubt among these alternatives. I am myself persuaded that the best bet is some variant of the spelling pattern approach (alternative 5). But I would welcome more hard data which made me more comfortable about my bet or caused me to lose it. The problems of sequence and pacing also need more rigorous attention. Meanwhile, in the institutes, it seems to me we have to allow tolerance for diversity of approach.

I should hope that we could impress upon the institute members that a reader should be taught to use only as much of systematic attack in word identification as he needs to join words in a melody of meaning. He ought to have been trained to use the clues in concert, playing one against another to gain the proper harmony to fit the sentence. There is no inherent value in such extended analysis of individual words that the discourse loses integrity.

Word identification is the place where most effort in elementary reading instruction is directed. When we move out of that province to comprehension of discourse, we are in a darker realm. When I was a student at the University of Michigan in the thirties, Professor Fries used to tell us that lengthy treatises had been written on what a sentence was but among the treatises consensus was never achieved. It seems to me that in reading instruction today we are in similar straits about comprehension, not knowing clearly, to paraphrase John Ciardi, how a sentence does mean. The whole domain of "comprehension" in connected discourse requires closer analysis than we have had.

I will venture some "hunches"--but they cannot be dignified by a stronger term than that. I suspect we have confused code and content. We can probably emphasize in the beginning code skill--the identification of words and of typical sentence patterns. (See Roberts, English Sentences, Harcourt, 1963.) Perhaps at that beginning level we do not need to emphasize so centrally content. (Though I am reminded that one of my students, viewing a text designed primarily to teach code and without much attention to content, opined that the "text tottered toward torpidity.") But very soon the demands of the reader must surely shift to the content borne by the code. In that case, I have long wondered what we should do. If we stay with the literary mode (almost all reading instruction proceeds through fiction), should we not transfer our attention soon to teaching literature as literature? Is it not flying in the face of reality to pretend that the literary mode is a generally viable way of communicating for all disciplines? For example, is the text of the new mathematics "literary" in any functional sense? If the literary is not the most serviceable mode, what should we do? If we should abdicate the literary in our basic texts for reading instruction (after conquering code), would it be feasible at all to teach general patterns of exposition? Most of the curriculum is invested in exposition. At first glance at least, it seems that some kind of economy might be achieved by teaching the patterns of exposition servicing, for example, social studies, science and mathematics. I leave it to you to decide between the literary and expository alternatives. But whatever you decide it does seem to me that in elementary school, we must shift our emphasis sooner from code to content.

Of course, whatever we decided to emphasize in general reading instruction, we know such instruction cannot care completely for comprehension in the separate disciplines. Even if general patterns of exposition were taught in basic reading instruction, the use of these patterns to manipulate the ideas and skills of each discipline would have to be part of the day-by-day instruction within that field. I hope we would not for a moment in these institutes countenance the notion that in the basic reading program some passing swipe at reading in the "content fields" can care in any fundamental sense for developing ability to read effectively within the different disciplines.

If we can achieve some kind of consensus on what institute members ought to know about word identification and comprehension, we can direct our attention to instructional procedures and arrangements. I suppose the most important concept about procedure which I would have institute members develop concerns relevance. There are in basic reader manuals enough procedures to last a teacher through several life times. What is needed is a heightened sense of relevance: which children need what instruction? It is all too easy to make a career of any selection, traveling methodically through every suggested procedure until surely the children must cry, "How long, O Lord, how long!" It seems to me that the best hope for achieving relevance in procedure is a sharpened rationale. That is why earlier I said we need not less theory but better theory integrally related to practice.

The other emphasis in procedure which I would like to see would encourage teachers to make themselves exemplars of the best in English language command. I would have teachers be expert story tellers, not just in kindergarten but throughout the elementary school. I would have teachers be skilled explainers. Thus children would have a model in both the literary and expository mode personifying the resources of the language. Children would have extended access to vocabulary. They would hear how a sentence means. They would listen to aesthetic qualities: sound, rhythm, imagery. They would attend to ideas being structured in patterns explicitly designed to guide their practices in speaking, reading, and writing.

I would try to persuade institute teachers to read aloud every day. Children need to see at least one person daily who loves to read and rejoices in the opportunity to share that satisfaction. They need to hear how the language goes when you make the most of it. The echo will resound long after in both their oral and silent reading. Surely there is no more potent procedure in reading instruction than the reading aloud of a well-loved teacher with obvious, real, uninhibited pleasure.

My paper grows over-long; so I turn quickly to instructional arrangement. I believe we must help teachers see that good teaching cannot be routine. Instructional arrangements must somehow reflect the individuality of the reading act. Any time children can anticipate perfectly exactly what will be attempted day-in and day-out, the effectiveness of instruction will surely suffer. Children should not know with a dreary certainty that, however well they read the piece, the albatross of seat work will be hung about their necks.

Just as a reader should not always know what is bound to happen each day, so I believe he should not always be stuck with the same grouping. Sometimes the groups may be gathered by achievement criteria, sometimes performance, sometimes library research. Sometimes the reader ought to be in no group at all but pursue his own individualized program. I would hope that we could agree that no system of grouping is sacrosanct. As in instructional procedure, so in instructional arrangement, relevance ought to be the critical factor. What will this arrangement do for this child, for these children? No teacher can do any more grouping than he can live with. He can live with no more grouping than he can plan for. Without clearly relevant arrangements, he could have the ultimate in flexibility: chaos.

Grouping also relates to the effectiveness of instruction with the markedly advanced or the markedly retarded. Our institute clients will tell us, however we might wish to avoid a painful topic, that instruction does not meet these extremes very satisfactorily in most schools. In the intermediate grades this spread becomes particularly acute. Conscientious teachers are torn as they see some children embittered and others just bored with the essential irrelevance or even absence of instruction. I suspect none of us has an elixir to assuage all this pain. Certainly I have no guaranteed remedy. But I have been increasingly forced to the position that, at least by the middle grades, some children, at both ends of the continuum, must have specialized instruction. For some children, there must be, in addition, far larger access to clinical facilities. I said there was no magic in my position. If any of you has more potent medicine, I hope you will not keep silent.

Now I have just two more topics: materials and evaluation. I hope to be economical in my discussion. It seems to me mandatory that each institute be equipped with an instructional materials center. Professional books there must be, of course, but at least as important is the availability of a catholic array of classroom materials and devices. New basal readers ought to be there, of course, but there ought also to be available the various experimental materials (linguistic, programmed, ITA, words in color, etc.). I would like to see children's literature well represented. Of all the audio-visual devices, it seems to me the language laboratory is most important. The possibilities for native language enhancement for reading as well as speaking especially for children with another language background or with a markedly substandard dialect ought not to be ignored. The new computer-based instructional systems are too expensive to be available to every institute but at the very least descriptive literature about them should be accessible. Beyond having a representative collection available, the institute members, of course, need opportunity to make judgments about the relevance of the materials to specific instructional tasks.

At long last, I come to evaluation. The concept of continuing appraisal of instruction should pervade the institute. We need to help teachers place the standardized instruments in the perspective of all the ways by which instruction can be gauged. A library of evaluation guides as well as formal and informal tests ought to be at hand. And certainly every teacher ought to become more familiar with the Mental Measurements Yearbook. Teachers need to know the fallibilities as well as the strengths of commonly-employed evaluative measures. Especially they need to develop enough sophistication to look beyond summary scores or statements to the details which might affect future instruction.

So I have finished. Obviously I have neglected many aspects of reading instruction. Even so, it seems unlikely that all of what I have discussed can be well-communicated in eight weeks. (I have not touched at all on what is involved in effective communication in the institute so that teachers do in fact emerge willing and able to change their instructional behaviors. I look forward to conference discussion on this vital matter.) It may be that the conference members may wish to suggest foci for institutes without sacrificing the sense of community which ought to govern English language arts instruction. For example, could some institute be especially designed for beginning reading, some for more advanced levels? Or, to cut the content another way, could some institutes focus on children's literature? If we should decide to advocate some sharply-defined provinces for institutes, I would hope that we would not neglect the foundation of which I spoke earlier.

Whatever we decide, I hope we can keep the far view. If we do our work well, we help children to gain a command, important all life long. We can all think of a child of whom it could be said, as he made the power of reading his own:

> He ate and drank the precious words,
> His spirit grew robust;
> He knew no more that he was poor,
> Nor that his frame was dust.
>
> He danced along the dingy days,
> And this bequest of wings
> Was but a book. What liberty
> A loosened spirit brings!
>
> Emily Dickinson

# REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON READING

## Introduction

The committee on reading consisted of the following members:

Dolores Durkin
Jack Holmes
Lowell Hovis
William Iverson
Carl Lefevre
Donald Rasmussen
Robert Ruddell
Rose Sabaroff
Sam Sebesta
Henry Sustakoski
Kay Torrant
Priscilla Tyler
Rosemary Wilson

The task of this committee was to prepare guidelines for a coherent institute program for elementary English language arts teaching. Specifically the committee was asked to formulate these guidelines in the area of reading instruction.

The committee delimited for consideration the following blocks of study:

I. Basic knowledge about the English language felt essential for the language arts teacher charged with the instruction program in reading.

II. Functional understandings from the areas of sociology and psycholinguistics (or socio-psycholinguistics) relative to the reading program.

III. Methodological factors and knowledge believed essential for an improvement of individual teacher competencies in teaching reading.

It must be clearly understood that the content selected by the institute director to be included in these areas must be selected in relation to the specific objectives the institute director hopes to achieve. In approaching the content selection it is of utmost importance that the director consider the participant's professional preparation, the composition of his school population, and anticipated program trends in school settings. The following discussion should therefore be considered as tentative in nature.

## Outline of Content Discussed

I. Basic Knowledge About the English Language

  A. Concept of Change

  B. History of the Development of Language Study

  C. Clarification of the Term Grammar

  D. The Structure of English

  E. Primacy of Language for Learning of Many Kinds Including Learning to Read

  F. Concept of Dialects--Phonological, Lexical, and Grammatical Aspects

II. Functional Understandings from Sociology and Psycholinguistics

  A. Views on the Way Language is Learned

  B. The Nature of Language Ability or Competence

  C. The Development of Words, Meanings and Concepts

  D. The Learning of Oral Language Structure

  E. Psychological Factors Affecting Language Development

  F. A Psychological Framework Essential to Language Learning Experiences

III. Methodological Factors Essential for Improving Teacher Competencies

  A. Implications From Reading and Language Research for the Teaching of Reading

  B. Theories of Reading and the Classroom Teacher

  C. The Development of Word Recognition and Basic Comprehension Skills

  D. Criteria for Evaluating Reading Materials

  E. Evaluation and Diagnosis of Reading Development

F. Literature and the Reading Program

G. General Organization of the Institute

H. Various Institute Formats

I. Evaluation of the Institute

Appendices:

Position Papers
Evaluation of position papers

## I.

## Basic Knowledge About The English Language

It was generally agreed that a course on the structure of the language be considered for the institute participant. Such a course should encompass levels ranging from phonology through syntax. The committee defined the content of this section in a very specific way. The detailed outline to follow represents this definition; the following materials were recommended for background development on a lay level for the institute:

1. Strickland, Ruth G. The Contribution of Structural Linguistics to the Teaching of Reading, Writing and Grammar in the Elementary School (Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Vol. 40, No. 1, Jan. 1964).

2. National Elementary Principal (October and November issues, 1965).

3. Selected Articles from Elementary English, especially the Linguistics and Reading Issue, December, 1965.

4. Lefevre, Carl. Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

5. Fries, Charles. Linguistics and Reading (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1963).

6. A book of readings in applied English linguistics.

7. TV series by John Bostain (Washington Foreign Service Institute of the State Department).

8. The Reading Teacher, December 1964, Linguistics and Reading issue.

9. Linguistics and Reading, Pamphlet to be published by IRA, May, 1966.

The following is a general outline of topics in "Basic Knowledge about the English Language" for purposes of institute planning:*

A. Concept of Change

   1. Origin of English (Germanic not a Romance Language)
   2. Brief history of English emphasizing phonological and grammatical change

B. History of the Development of Language Study

   1. Early grammars (The Greeks, Panini, etc.)
   2. 18th and 19th century grammars
   3. Modern language analysis
      a. Bloomfield, Fries, Sapir, Whorf and others
      b. Contemporary language study

C. Clarification of the Term Grammar

   1. The inherent grammatical system of language--i.e., word order vs. inflected languages
   2. Grammar as a description of a language system--i.e., various linguistic models
      a. Structural--Fries
      b. Tagmemic--Pike
      c. Transformational--Chomsky
      d. Aspectual--Trager-Smith

   (Though a particular instructor will give allegiance to a particular linguistic model, teachers should be made aware that there are other systems and should be told of the basic differences in the approaches of the various models.)

D. The Structure of English

   1. Phonology

---

* Sections of D, E, & F would receive the largest amount of time and importance.

    a. Phonetics
    b. Phonemics (including practice in phonemic transcription).
  2. Morphology
    a. Morphophone (Linguon, morphophoneme)
    b. Morphophone--grapheme correspondence
    c. Morphemics
  3. Syntax--sentence patterning
  4. Intonation
    a. Phonemic, morphemic and syntactic significance of intonation.

E. Primacy of Language for learning of many kinds including learning to read.

  1. Inter-relationships of speech and writing
  2. The study of writing systems

F. Concept of Dialects-Phonological, Lexical, and Grammatical aspects

  1. Efficiency of dialects as means of communication in particular speech committees
  2. Social associations of dialects (social, personal and literary)*
  3. Appropriateness of usage,** socially and vocationally
  4. Regional dialects ***

  Note: The teacher should promote the idea that people tend to use different dialects in different situations in order to obtain optimum communication. The child should be given the idea that his local dialect is his, but other dialects are also his for the learning. As teachers, we are concerned that the child acquire a dialect or dialects which will give him the fullest possible range of types of communication with his fellows in the English-speaking community.

---

* A social dialect is a system of speech practices distinguishing one socio-economic-culture group from another in a regional speech community. A person has a repertoire of personal dialects from which in any given situation or at any given moment he selects the one which he, either as the result of custom or his own taste, considers the most appropriate. Martin Joos suggests five such personal dialects (intimate, consultative, etc.) in "The Five Clocks," Chapters 1-5 in Dudley Bailey, ed., Essays on Rhetoric (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). Each individual has his unique set of such personal dialects which may be subsumed under what we call the individual's idiolect. A literary dialect is a set of linguistic practices more characteristic of one literary form or mode than of another.

**Usage is a selection of lexical items and grammatical patterns suitable to a situation.

***A dialect is the complete linguistic system of a geographical or social group.

## II

## Functional Understandings from Sociology and Psycholinguistics

The committee based much of their discussion in this area on John B. Carroll's guidelines. Following are some topics in the psychology of language that should be included in an institute course:

1. It is necessary to outline the developmental sequence in which children learn their language, e.g., Josephine McCarthy *The Manual for Child Psychology*. The sequence seems quite regular for all children, from one-word sentences to more complex sequences. Many grammatical structures are already present in children's language when they come to school, where their use of language and their precision in usage continue to expand. Children are often able to respond to more advanced grammatical signals in a listening situation before they can produce them themselves in speech. Since it is not known how language development actually comes about, various views should be briefly presented. (For example, Skinner's view is that the child tries out sounds and is reinforced for certain ones.) The important thing is to alert the teacher to the presence of a developmental sequence.

2. Some attention should be given to the nature of language ability or competence.

3. Words, meanings and concepts are particularly important and should be given some attention. John B. Carroll has written a valuable article entitled "Words, Meanings and Concepts," which appeared in the *Harvard Educational Review* (Spring, 1964). Dr. Carroll emphasizes the need to learn by positive and negative instances, for if we drill on one item alone the learning is not as good as that which comes from recognizing the instance by contrasting it with a negative instance. An example at the fourth grade level might be differentiating between a tourist and an immigrant. In younger children we might be concerned with contrasts in terms of classifying words or objects, or categorizing. In learning a word, an example would be differentiating between "mad" and "made."

4. Problems of vocabulary development, vocabulary size, and so on require continuous attention.

5. The learning of oral language structure is more or less automatic, given a normal stimulating environment. So for the average child very little need be done in bringing language structure to a conscious level. For the child who lacks a "normal stimulating environment" the school may have to intercede and provide an intimate, rich and stimulating environment. (Courtney Cazden's doctoral research at Harvard in early language development points out the superior value of language 'interaction' in an intimate setting over a more formal structuring of language 'interaction.' Her work may be pertinent here.)

6. There are psychological factors affecting language development (home background, child rearing methods, personality development). These factors can become particularly pertinent with children coming from deprived areas. Rich experience must interact with language development if empty verbalisms are to be avoided.

7. Relationships between intelligence and language development should be looked at briefly.

8. The relationship between thought and language should also be given consideration.

9. Some elementary ideas about communication are necessary. Teachers need to have some understanding of the operation of feedback, information capacity, redundancy and so on.

Of course it would be possible to have a whole year's course in sociology and psycholinguistics. In the institute teachers should at least be introduced to many of these items, perhaps during a week of lecture and discussion. Implementation cannot be confined to a lecture presentation. The lectures must be punctuated with occasions for active teacher interaction in small groups, where previous classroom experiences can be analyzed and brought to bear on the lecture points made. The teachers should also be required to translate the ideas presented in lecture and discussion into examples for classroom implementation. Where possible, materials should be made available to the teachers during their discussions. Materials might include diagnostic tests, lesson plans, examples of children's work for analysis, and actual work with children. Again, a practicum is strongly recommended for the institute. Children should be available; teachers should have opportunities to try out the new ideas suggested in a classroom setting and individually.

Pertinent to the content of this sociological and psycholinguistic block are the following pages from Robert B. Ruddell's Content of A

Reading Institute:[1]

"The content of the institute could profitably include an examination of stages of concept development such as those proposed by Inhelder and Piaget. Bruner's discussion of concept formation, concept attainment and learning transfer as related to the structure of subject matter would also hold significant value in such a discussion.

"Teachers should thus be encouraged to search for factors which produce varied degrees of language proficiency in the child. Related investigations suggest that children's language and reading achievement is a function of: provision for an appropriate language model, the opportunity for parent-child interaction, sex differences, intelligence differences, auditory and visual discrimination ability, and socio-economic level. Further, a number of studies point to the close interrelationships which exist among the language skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing.

"From investigations such as those indicated above the institute can serve to help the teacher develop an added awareness of operational factors essential for language and reading development in the classroom. These include:

1. Specific attention to the importance of oral language development as a base for the teaching of reading

2. Concept development encompassing the vocabulary and syntactical depth and scope utilized in the reading materials

3. Reading readiness levels precipitated by experiential and instructional variation which must be anticipated and accounted for over an extremely wide range at all grade levels, and

4. Methodological approaches requiring adjustment in relation to the various types of learners encountered in the classroom.

"Consideration should be given in the institute to factors encompassing a psychological framework essential to language learning experiences. From an operational point of view the following factors exemplify such a framework directly influencing the child's success in reading. (Introspectively the institute teacher may ask, "How do I implement each of the following elements in my reading program?")

---

[1] Published by The International Reading Association, Spring, 1966.

Readiness. The teacher must be concerned with the background that the learner brings to the reading situation regardless of his reading level. The significant point is to identify the child's functioning level in word perception and comprehension skill development.

Motivation. This essential element in language learning should be considered by the teacher both from an extrinsic and intrinsic point of view. The child's interest and persistence may remain at a high level in anticipation of verbal praise from his teacher. On the other hand, the interest and persistence may result from functional pleasure due to the enjoyment received in participating in the vicarious experience afforded in the story. Careful consideration should be given to the importance of motivation in reading and to the examination of methods by which this factor can be strengthened in the classroom reading program.

Cues. Consideration should be given to the organization of the reading materials used in the instructional program. The rationale for the organization, sequencing, presentation, and provision for transfer of word attack and comprehension skills should be examined. This information should then be considered in light of cue adjustment relative to children possessing unique backgrounds and characteristics.

Response. Learner activity is extremely important in reading instruction. The teacher must observingly inquire about the nature of the response as it reflects meaningfulness and transferability for the individual child.

Reinforcement. The consequences of the reader's activity is of vital significance to the child and the teacher. The child must be provided with some feed-back as to the nature of his response. The teacher must consider ways in which this can be accomplished most effectively for the individual youngster.

Transfer. The provision in the reading program for utilization of reading skill development in a new learning situation is of vital importance. Reading materials should be examined for this provision. The teacher will also need to carefully consider how transfer of word recognition and

and comprehension skills can be effected in various content areas of the curriculum."

## III

## Methodology of Reading Instruction

It was believed essential that the reading section of the institute should attempt to achieve a balance between review of research findings and a careful examination of specific methods and techniques used in the improvement of reading instruction.

Effective provision for individual needs demands that the institute participant be familiar with group assessment and individual reading inventories. This should include the administration and interpretation of group and individual reading tests and inventories. Specific concerns may also be given to remediation techniques including the utilization of self-developed and published reading materials appropriate for a wide range of reader deficiencies.

### A. Reading and Language Research

It was suggested in relation to reading research that the institute participants be apprised of ready and available sources of the reports of experimental results. The participant's attention should be focused on such journals as *The Reading Teacher*, *Elementary English*, *The Reading Research Quarterly*, *The Review of Educational Research*, *The Journal of Education Research*, and the report on reading available from the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC). Perhaps it would be wise for the instructors of the institutes to structure their reporting of research so that it brings into focus the underlying principles which support or do not support the various methods in the field of reading currently being considered in their particular institutes.

Even though much of methodological research lacks the rigor of carefully controlled laboratory research, partially because of the many classroom and teacher variables involved, attention should be given to the nature of the reading program studied; the type of achievement assessment made; the type of instruments utilized; and the point in the instructional program that the criterion measures were administered. In this way a great deal of clarity can be added to the interpretation of the outcomes.

## B. Theories of Reading and the Classroom Teacher

The elementary teacher, as a teacher of reading as well as as the new math and science, should be made to feel that she is an important contributor to the development of an exciting and expanding inter-discipline knowledge. There is a large amount of research concerning the reading process going on at present, research which will enhance our understanding as to which powers of understanding must be activated in the mind of the child before he can learn to read. To catch the spirit and zest of this research, at least the more advanced institute participant should be introduced to the following theories which are demanding a great deal of attention from contemporary scholarship:

1. Brain dominance and sensory modality theories
2. Linguistic theories
3. Maturation and organismic theories
4. Neural-chemical synaptic transmission theory
5. Operational conditioning theory
6. Oculomotor functional control (eye-movement) theory
7. Substrata-factor theory
8. Tactile-kinesthetic theory

## C. Word Recognition and Comprehension Skills

The practical aspects of teaching word attack skills should encompass the use of word form clues, context clues, phonic analysis, structural analysis, tactile kinesthetic exercises, and the development of dictionary skills. It is also important that reading purpose relative to levels of comprehension (including direct recall, ideas in sequence, generalization, inference and application) be given consideration from the applied standpoint at various grade levels.

## D. Criteria for Evaluating Reading Materials

Note: The following list suggests some of the main points in the traditional reading program and suggests new ones, particularly some new approaches relating linguistic studies to reading.

Does the Reading Program provide for or have:

1. A rationale (dialectic, philosophy). (What does the program do? Is it a total, balanced program? )
2. Consistency. The consistency with which this rationale (dialectic, philosophy) is carried out by the materials of the program
3. Oral Language development
4. Recognition of the state of the child's oral language development
5. Suitable materials for oral reading
6. Consistency of patterns in the correspondence between the sound unit and its graphemic representations
7. Development in recognition of types of print space signals (poetry, paragraphing)
8. Materials for indicating that the writing system operates by patterns
9. Materials for the development of the sense of rhyme and rhythm
10. Development of recognition of stress and information patterns and their meanings
11. Materials for developing auditory-verbal and visual-verbal perception
12. Word perception cues
    a. pictorial cues
    b. context cues
    c. phonics cues
    d. structural analysis cues
    e. tactile kinesthetic exercise cues
    f. dictionary skill cues
    g. minimal contrast set cues

13. Comprehension skills
    a. recall skills
    b. continuity devices (e.g., use of pronouns to carry on an idea)
    c. transition devices
    d. sequencing skills
    e. inference skills
    f. application skills

14. Logical sequence in the development of skills

15. Treating language as a representation of meaning from the phoneme through the word, phrase, and sentence to the literary form (lexical emphasis)

16. Treating reading as an example of the language system in operation (the graphemic system, the phonemic system, the systematic patterning of phonemic-graphemic correspondence,* morphology, syntax) /linguistic emphasis/

17. Beginning readers. The kind of vocabulary the materials start with; appropriateness to children being taught

18. Beginning readers. Speed with which content deepens

19. Concept load

20. Concept development

21. Content reflective of multi-ethnic society

22. Content reflective of multidialectal society

---

*The sound unit-graphemic correspondence means that there is a graphemic representation for a generalized sound unit. For example, the grapheme ou represents the dialect variants /$_a$w/, æw/, ew/, and /əw/ in the word round. The vowel nucleus of the word round is pronounced variously in various dialects: /rawnd/ (general Eastern Virginia) and /rəwnd/ (Toronto). This level of sound unit has been variously called morphophone, linguon or morphophoneme. The morphophone also subsumes the varying pronunciations of the vowel nucleus in stressed and unstressed syllables. For example, the vowel nucleus of the stressed syllables in parental becomes schwa/ə/ or barred i /ɨ/ in the same syllable when it is unstressed as in parent.

23. Content related to child's experience

24. Content related to various fields of academic subject matter

25. Materials for encouraging children's responses

26. Materials for reinforcing children's responses

27. Concepts of literary form: theme, plot, characterization, style

28. Discourse line: sequencing of events, sequencing of ideas

29. Composition development in relation to reading

30. Literary materials using patterns of language particularly productive or used in the 1960's (linguistic change in the making)

31. Phases. Stages of the reading process from decoding to comprehension, to literary and linguistic criticism defined and pointed up at least in the teacher's manual

32. Materials bringing out the relationship between lexicography--and reading at the comprehension level--and literary criticism (Emphasis on language and its meaning or lexical referent)

33. Materials for reading in a non-Western or academic (e. g., IPA) writing system (Study of writing emphasis)

34. Materials for identifying distinctions in regional, social, and personal dialects. Such materials may be related to the literary dialects distinguishing one literary form from another, e. g., the language of prose vs. the language of poetry (Dialects emphasis)

35. Evaluation materials ?

E. Evaluation and Diagnosis

Provision should be made to acquaint teachers with a variety of testing materials: their administration, scoring interpretation, application to classroom teaching, and limitations.

1. Standardized Tests

Tests:
- Readiness
- Syntax and morphology
- Vocabulary knowledge
- Phonics inventory
- Word recognition
- Reading vocabulary
- Sentence comprehension
- Paragraph comprehension
- Study skills

Analysis:
- What is a standardized test?
- What information do these tests provide for the teacher?
- What are the limitations of standard tests for establishing levels of reading for individual children?
- How does one interpret total scores, subscores, item scores (from raw data, from standard scores)?

2. Informal Reading Inventories

Tests:
- Groups and individual
- Phonics inventories
- Guided observation

Analysis:
- What information does the Informal Reading Inventory provide?
- How does one determine the reading levels of an individual pupil (independent, instructional, frustration, and listening capacity levels)?

3. Readability Formulas

Tests:
- Primary
- Intermediate
- Based on syllable count rather than word lists
- How to find reading level of reading materials

Teachers should be given an opportunity to take the tests and analyze the information made available. If possible, teachers should administer tests to children and interpret results.

## F. Literature

Teachers should be given time and opportunity to enjoy some of the best in children's literature. If we are to build interest in books and lifetime reading habits, teachers must be encouraged to know some of the best in children's books--longer narratives, short stories, plays, expository writings and poetry. An important ingredient of any reading program, at any grade level in the elementary school, is daily oral reading to the children. Therefore the institute should provide for the following:

1. A library encompassing a wide range of literary materials
2. A librarian who briefs teachers on various books and materials and acts as a resource person
3. Opportunities to read and share ideas about books within the institute group, as well as to read to laboratory classes or individual children
4. Opportunities to discuss techniques to use with groups or entire classes (For example: teacher or group reads myth or fairy tale to entire class; discussion on different levels of questions follows).
5. Opportunities to see films, hear recordings, etc., which inspire and entertain
6. Opportunities to meet authors whenever possible; also locate authors in school area for interviews later
7. Opportunities for drama. (Various interpretations of single incidents within a story should be studied so that many children in the clinical school may participate and be allowed to interpret their particular reaction to characters.)

## G. General Organization of the Institute

### 1. Purposes:

A practical institute for elementary language arts teachers should face the fact that its participants are in-service teachers who will return to their classrooms when the institute is over. Just as the teacher must accept the child, so directors of institutes and institute faculties must honestly accept the teacher participants as beings of worth and dignity and as professional colleagues. Unless this basic relationship is established as a matter of explicit agreement among institute staff members (and by everything implicit in their conduct of the institute), the impact of the institute in the teachers' classrooms will be weak.

A successful introductory institute must deal effectively with broad concepts about language, language learning, speech, composition, reading and literature. The acid test of such an institute is whether it persuades the participants to alter some of their teaching attitudes and some of their ways in the classroom. It is possible to open up new areas of subject matter and new techniques in such a way as to motivate teachers to continue independently what they have started--by study on their own, by taking afternoon, evening, or Saturday courses, by attending professional conferences, and so on. This individual follow-up is most likely to occur if teachers have been actively involved in the work of the institute by means of observation and practice in classrooms, workshop discussions, seminars, panel presentations, and both oral and written interchanges or experience with other teachers.

2. Staff:

Adequate staff in at least three categories should be obtained: (1) resource staff of principal lecturers, (2) workshop leaders, and (3) clerical aides. The ideal member of the resource staff is the scholar-teacher, a person who can challenge and stimulate the participants. Such persons may come for a single day, for a week, or for a more extended period during the institute. Workshop leaders should be experienced teachers with enough knowledge of subject matter to be capable of interpreting it. They should be resourceful, creative and imaginative. Enough clerical aides should be provided to handle various secretarial and other related tasks such as the reproduction and distribution of papers.

3. Facilties:

The college or university should provide adequate facilities such as classrooms, seminar rooms, library, space for exhibits of instructional materials and tests, as well as staff and space to care for any children who are brought into the institute as pupils. Needs such as mail service, telephone service, food service, provision for coffee hours and social hours should be anticipated and adequately met.

4. Activities:

Following are suggestions of activities that may be developed by individual workshops to suit the local circumstances. The institute director needs adequate time free of other duties for advance planning. Advance planning conferences should be arranged for the resource staff and the workshop leaders. A daily period, if possible, should be set aside for meetings of the resource people and the workshop leaders. There should be resource periods, which may be filled with lectures, lecture discussions, demonstrations, films, classroom observations, and panel presentations. And provision should be made for informal coffee breaks and social hours where participants can discuss the matters taken up in the institute with each other, with workshop leaders, and with the resource personnel. Another activity that is of major importance is the interaction meeting where the participants exchange and evaluate classroom experiences. These may be special interest groups or discussion groups organized according to the grade level the teachers teach. These groups need to have experienced leadership, and should be enriched by visits of the resource persons.

Some of the activities which would grow out of these interaction meetings would be written assignments: reactions to assigned readings, and reactions to lectures and demonstrations of learning materials examined. Such reaction papers, might be based on research by participants or on efforts to think through the implications of institute experiences. So far as possible there should be a mimeographed distribution of selected papers. Possibly a collection of selected papers could be gathered for the participant to take home at the end of the conference.

During these interaction sessions teachers will want to exchange experiences, prepare lesson plans, work out learning sequences for their classes, discuss and prepare teaching projects both short and long term that they might carry out when they return to their classrooms. In all of these activities the participants need sympathetic but firm guidance from the workshop leaders to keep the groups from becoming little buzz sessions. The lunch break can also provide a social hour for additional interaction of the participants and allow some free time for independent work such as reading, studying, and examining learning materials on display.

### H. Various Institute Formats

Various formats for institutes having different purposes may be considered. For example: (1) A one-summer institute; (2) A two-summer institute that would prepare teachers for a year of experimentation followed by an institute for evaluation in the third summer; (3) A summer institute followed by an in-service course or classroom fellowship; (4) Parallel institutes (e.g., on reading, composition, literature, or speech) sharing a common program in the essential block, language; and (5) A full-time-graduate-study program using fellowships.

### I. Evaluation of the Institute

Provision should be made for evaluating the effectiveness of the institute. The success of the institute can best be measured in terms of its application of new knowledge in the classroom. Operationally this success may be measured by follow-up meetings or institutes in which teachers present evidence of the application of institute knowledge in their classes. The institute director or his staff may wish to observe the participants in their classrooms for evidence of the use of institute content and methods. Teacher opinion of institute topics may be of value in generating new ideas relative to the institute content and the establishment of other institutes.

## Appendix A: Presentation of Position Papers

(The secretary of the conference suggested to members of the conference that they write one-page position papers before the conference--these to be circulated and discussed as part of the intellectual activity of the meeting. A large number of members of the Reading Committee submitted such position papers and summaries of the papers together with some indication of the discussion which followed the presentation of the papers is included here to give the reader a sense of the diversity of opinion which lies behind the reports.)

### READING AND DIAGNOSTIC TOOLS: Jack A. Holmes

Some of the points emphasized by Dr. Holmes in his presentation included the following:

1. "Reading to learn" and "learning to read": processes which mutually reinforce each other which should be active from the very beginning of the reading program.

2. The necessity of developing many subskills to assist a student to "read with power";

3. The need for emphasis upon visual and auditory modalities (from standpoint of in-put, mediating, and out-put);

4. "The necessity of increasing vocabulary and of seeing verbal relationships"--importance of fractionating skills in order to analyze and deal with them adequately; these skills should then be integrated into the reading process itself.

## Comments of Committee Members:

Various committee members questioned Dr. Holmes' suggestion that the student "read, read, read." Most agreed that there must be more than just reading since it is possible to have reading without thinking. There is no inevitable connection between the two processes. Discussion followed with Dr. Holmes clarifying his position on this point and, in the main, agreeing with the comments of the committee members.

Dr. Holmes made the additional point that while a reader must bring something to the printed page, a book also has something to deliver to the reader. It is the responsibility of the reader to extract this information from the printed page.

Several committee members commented upon the concept of learning to read in the lower grades and reading to learn in the upper grades as "old-fashioned" and not consistent with the most recent thinking of reading as a continuing and developing process from the earliest level. Dr. Holmes was in agreement that his designation of the third to fourth grade as a dividing line in these two phases of reading was too arbitrary and could not be justified in the light of the most recent research and thinking. Some members commented on the influence of television and other media of instruction upon the general sophistication and maturity of children even at the first-grade level.

Dr. Iverson emphasized the fact that the previous concept of "learning to read" had often resulted in stretching out programs of word identification for as long as three years by means of a tightly controlled vocabulary and little else. He felt that this had delayed much too long the whole effort to have children "get at the power of reading" as soon as possible in the educative process.

## A Position on Professor Iverson's Position Paper[1]: Donald Rasmussen

---

[1] For further discussion, see Appendix B, page 25.

The following are the major distinctions presented by Dr. Rasmussen in his position paper:

1. Problems of comprehending language and problems of reading are separate.
2. Learning a language and learning about language are separate.
3. Learning to encode (writing and spelling) and learning to decode (reading) are separate.
4. The stage of autistic reading (the beginning stage), the stage of egocentric reading, and the logico-meaningful stage are separate.
5. Problems of class organization (individual vs. group) and problems of reading method (deductive vs. inductive) are related.

### Comments of Committee Members:

The chairman asked for clarification of the three stages of reading as outlined by Rasmussen. He was interested in the approximate length of the three periods or stages of reading as well as the part which individual differences would play in this process. Several committee members raised the question of the way in which teachers would be aware of these stages, particularly in situations where they are working with large groups of young children. There was almost universal disagreement with Rasmussen on the point of not introducing a simultaneous program of reading and writing. Dr. Iverson, in particular, stated that he felt the position of Rasmussen on this point was indefensible. Unfortunately time did not permit an adequate discussion of this very important point or afford Dr. Rasmussen an opportunity for rebuttal.

Several members of the committee also questioned the statement that "the reading class is the poorest environment of all in which to teach language." As the result of the discussion arising from this question as well as that dealing with "decoding," there was general agreement that a definition of terms was very much needed. Again, limitations of time cut off discussion.

### Introductory Institutes for Elementary Language Arts Teachers: Carl A. Lefevre

Dr. Lefevre emphasized the following points in his discussion:

1. The necessity of keeping in mind the idea of what is practical for an introductory institute for classroom teachers at the

elementary level;

2. The need to keep the content of the institute course under control with continuing stress upon those matters of greatest importance to teachers in service;

3. The importance of the institute faculty's acceptance of teachers as people and as colleagues;

4. The value of having children involved in demonstration situations in all institutes;

5. The importance of providing possibilities for interchange of ideas--"a yeasty ferment" of speeches, panels, discussion groups, etc.;

6. The importance of having teachers constantly aware of the interplay of our two language systems--speech and writing.

Dr. Lefevre stressed the idea that, by means of the institutes, we are trying to persuade people to alter their behavior--a subtle and often difficult undertaking.

## Comments of Committee Members:

All committee members were in agreement with the suggestions made by Dr. Lefevre and heartily endorsed his plan of organization for the institutes. One member made the point that we should try to make use of, in our work with teachers in the institutes, the same 'good' techniques we make use of in working with children in classrooms. It was agreed that this is not an easy task.

## Appendix B.

## Rasmussen--Reading: Preliminary Discussions on Reading[1]

Professor Iverson summarized his paper on the Place of Reading in the Language Arts Institute. The discussion began with different members of the committee expressing reactions to Professor Iverson's remarks; their comments can be seen to reflect a remarkable agreement that Professor Iverson had covered the important aspects of the problem, that he had raised many of the points that might be of issue.

---

[1] What follows is a summary of preliminary first-day discussions of Professor Iverson's paper.

There was difference of opinion in regard to the participation of languages in the reading institute, as well as discussion on the labeling of any reading program as "linguistic." Professor Sustakoski felt that linguists were better able to speak for themselves and their field at institutes than were representatives and interpreters who might reduce the accumulated knowledge of linguists to an intellectual pablum. Professor Lefevre retorted that linguists themselves might add their own misinterpretations or might be equally misunderstood.

There was an obvious interest in the group on the issue of relating decoding as a skill in reading with the comprehension of content. Miss Torrant felt that there had been some misunderstanding of the early use of linguistics in reading programs because of the assumption that this part of reading would constitute the total reading program. Miss Durkin asked the meaning of a "linguistic approach." Rasmussen felt that giving the label of "linguistics" to an approach in reading was a misnomer, that it was done as a temporary step in the history of the subject in order to denote those particular programs that were conscious of an indebtedness to the findings of the field of linguistics. The "linguistics" label is being outgrown; there is no more point to the labeling of a reading program as "linguistic" than there is to the labeling of it as "psychological." All programs use information from both of these fields. Miss Wilson expressed the view that our basic institute problem was what to do with teachers who know so little about our language, its history and change, etc. There was very general agreement expressed by Lefevre, Sustakoski, Ruddell and others that all institutes would have to face the paucity of knowledge teachers of reading have. Ruddell cited the work of Harry Levin in pointing out that the gap of information teachers have about psychology equals that of linguistics. Professor Sabaroff suggested that we consider a first block of attention in all institutes go to the study of language; that a second block be assigned to the relevant aspects of psychology, especially the problems of provoking discovery; that a third block be devoted to analysis of the problem of relating the knowledge about language and psychology to the varied and specific programs of reading instruction; a fourth block of time would be devoted to the subject of evaluation of the effectiveness of each program in teaching children of particular characteristics to read.

Lefevre raised the problem of naming institutes "reading institutes" when we are all agreed that at least a large block of their time would be devoted to language. This remark raised several questions that were asked of Dr. Sue Brett, representing the Office of Education. She was asked whether the Office of Education might be interested in a greater variety of institute programs, especially in terms of their time. She was asked whether the Office of Education was thinking of an institute program looking even five years ahead and to the development of teachers of extensive education and excellence. Miss Wilson also asked whether the guidelines for the participants in institutes formulated in the past are to be continued. Dr. Brett referred the questions to Dr. Slaughter. Several members agreed that institutes should have selected personnel for the very specific and well worked-out foci of attention.

There was still some question in the group as to whether the discussion at this point concerned a summer institute to last one summer and to cover reading only, or a one-summer institute to cover a reading focus within a total language arts program. The committee wondered whether there is a possibility of a two-summer institute or a summer institute to be followed by one year of study. During the session Dr. Slaughter told the committee that there can be no legal commitment for a two-summer institute but that a pattern may be emerging of having a one-summer institute followed by a "special" institute for second-year people, this to be differentiated from the academic year-long institutes.

## Appendix C. Additional Position Papers

### Jack A. Holmes: Reading and Diagnostic Tools

In the primary classes we teach pupils the basic elements of reading, but the student must utilize reading as a tool through which to master the subject matter of his courses. The essence of such mastery is the acquiring of new concepts, the expansion of his knowledge and understanding, and finally the integration of new information with old so that he may acquire not only mastery of a body of knowledge, but also the ability to think creatively within and across subject matter domains by seeing relationships not even apparent to the writers of his textbooks. That this last goal should be realized very often is, of course, not to be expected. Nevertheless, the school and its teachers must be charged with the task of preparing the way so that, as far as possible, every student has the opportunity to perform to the extent of his capacities. However, the more universally recognized goal is simply the mastering of a body of knowledge. This in itself is no mean task; and, for the great majority of students, it remains the classic objective of their reading assignments as they ascend the academic ladder. Although there have been many refinements by imaginative teachers who seek to embellish the specific techniques, the basic concepts that distinguish the aims at the lower and upper school levels are: (a) learning to read, versus (b) reading to learn. The change-over generally happens in earnest about the third-to-fourth grade.

At the higher levels, when a student is in trouble, it is usually because he is not keeping up with his classes. His grades suffer, and they are indicators that he is not mastering, up to the level of expectation of his teachers, the subject matter of his courses. The findings of group experimentation and clinical studies in this area may be summarized by stating that the cause of the trouble usually stems from (a) a temporary disruption of learning habits because the student has been emotionally upset or is under some extraordinary strain or anxiety, (b) the application of study habits which serve the student well in certain areas but which are not appropriate in others, and (c) the fact that a student never has developed the subskills, supportive abilities, and good learning habits in general, or for a specific subject in particular. The true locus of the last and most general problem, (c) above, resides for the most part in the simple fact that the student simply never has learned to read with power. For to read with power means that the student must be able to answer questions and solve problems based on the material read. Power goes beyond comprehension and may be recognized by the fact that the student has gained a working knowledge of a subject in contrast to simply a knowledge of it. To gain power then, a student must read with purpose, and his cognitive processes must be united in the active search for those associative links that will bestow upon the accumulated information an intrinsic organization which makes it worthy of being called "a body of knowledge." In order to do this, the student must learn to use to his best advantage the many clues and bits of information held within the words and phrases themselves but which are not apparent on a superficial reading. The keys by which the reader may discover such audio-visual, structural, and historic clues and contextual information are generally held in what one might call related mental subsystems of skills and supportive abilities (otherwise referred to as substrata factors). The differential diagnosis and improvement of the skills and abilities that underlie power of reading should constitute the major effort of any efficient remedial, developmental, or creative reading program.

The school should establish a systematic program of differential testing in order to identify, on the one hand, those students whom it might consider as poor readers, and, on the other hand, to discover the subskills and supportive abilities wherein these very students manifest shortcomings. Once discovered, the school can then take steps to correct them.

In order to make differential diagnoses for individual students, a survey of the total school should be carried out. Each school should develop its own norms for a standard set of subskills and supportive abilities, selected on the basis of previous research because they are known to undergird the ability to read with speed and power. At the higher grade levels, reading is reasoning and more. It is this element of "more" which, to a great extent, must be generalized beyond any specific subject matter area. Therein lie the intrinsic clues which we find embedded in the language itself (not only in the linguistic structure, but the literary structures common to the culture as well). These are the "extra" clues that when known allow the reader to reason about what he is reading with a sophistication that goes beyond the glib and superficial. This kind of reading calls for a true understanding of the deeper meanings of the word "read." Obviously, this is an oversimplification. Nevertheless, the target of the reading program should be the improvement of the academic achievement of the student, and not merely a course to improve reading per se. But reading to learn depends on many skills, and therefore, one must start at rock bottom and build toward an appreciation of what is best in the literature.

Now, as will be realized from the statements above, there are many subskills and supportive abilities that research has shown to be, in one way or another, important to speed and/or power in reading. If a student lacks one or more of these or has not learned to integrate the ones which he has already mastered; whatever reading success he does experience is accomplished in spite of these basic handicaps. In other words, he is hobbling along on a crutch. It is the objective of the reading program to diagnose these skills and abilities and to improve and conjoin them in such a way as to maximize for each student his effective speed and power of reading pattern. That is, the teacher must not only teach the remedial reader the skills and abilities he lacks, but must also teach him to integrate them into his own personal hierarchy, or working system, or pattern of abilities so that they may be brought into focus whenever he reads for speed and power. In this regard I should warn you that group studies per se can never tell us why a certain individual does or does not read up to capacity; such studies, when they explain the variance in reading success for the group as a whole, however, may be used to establish a set of extremely valuable norms against which to diagnose the skills and abilities of an individual student who must compete with the members of such a group. To put it in other terms, state or national norms are better than nothing, but by far the best for differential diagnostic purposes are the home-grown variety. Of course, all three are important for different purposes, and the more one has such information, the better one is able to assess not only student needs in relation to his group, but the school's needs in relation to the state and nation.

It is fortunate, indeed, that after a group study is done, the very same data are immediately available for individual diagnoses. That is, by means of the test scores, the reading specialist will know which students are not reading up to par, and, even more importantly, will be able to identify the exact skills and abilities in which the poor readers are weak. Remedial classes may then be formed on the basis of individual needs and taught accordingly. Furthermore, each student can be given individual assignments tailored to his personal needs and designed to fill in gaps revealed by diagnostic tests. At the first level we already know there are certain basic skills and abilities that everyone needs if he is going to be able to function even moderately successfully in reading. These include especially vocabulary, verbal analogies, and auding ability. Beyond these, when one starts contrasting good and poor readers, a host of other components enter the picture. They include: range of information, literary interest, school adjustment and morale, word sense, phonetic association, homonymic meaning, spelling, prefixes, suffixes, Latin and Greek roots, etc. Likewise, some students manifest difficulties at the perceptual level and in different modalities. In the *visual* modality, such students should also be tested in spatial relations, figure and ground, cue-symbol closure, perception of reversals, word discrimination, etc. In the *auditory* modality, they should be tested in pitch, tone-intensity, tonal movement, tonal memory, tone-quality, blends, and rhythm. Furthermore, in order to affect the visual or auditory areas of the brain (which Dr. Penfield refers to as the uncommitted cortex for language), the reality of life, experiences for which the symbols stand, must become associated with the prime modalities in the *tactile-kinesthetic sensations*. For example, in the worst cases, it is sometimes advisable, in order to get a very poor reader on the right track, to re-introduce him to reading by having him trace the letters of the words and word parts as he reads them aloud. Such cases exist, but they are rare.

A teacher of English is a teacher of reading, and to some extent, must have the ability to diagnose, prescribe, and teach all the above abilities not only separately, but in a unified way as well. This latter requirement demands that the teacher stimulate the student to *read*, *read*, *read* . . . and read some more, for it is only through reading that the separate subskills and supportive abilities become integrated into an efficient working system. It is not only the mastery of the many subskills and supportive abilities, but the establishing of an efficient interfacilitating pattern among them that makes for the good reader.

### Jack A. Holmes: *What Do Elementary Teachers Need to Know to Improve Instruction in English?*[1]

The major concern of elementary English teachers is the progressive development of the speaking and writing systems of English with children. Their first and fundamental need is to have at hand an accurate description of the speaking and writing systems and the relationship between them.

---

[1] The credit for this position paper goes to my seminar group: J. Martin, B. Jensen, C. Bhasin, B. Thomas, R. Elder, K. Alword, R. Shinn. We have been working together in this area for over a year.

Present elementary English programs fail to provide this description. One might charitably describe the content of most English textbooks for elementary children as an eclectic accumulation of (1) common errors of children's speech and writing (to be presented to children on the questionable basis that they need to be exposed to errors in order to avoid them), and (2) elements of classical Latin grammar, which generally described the operation of an inflectional, static language.

We may therefore identify and assign to first priority status the need for basic research to develop an adequate theoretical model of our speaking, writing, and reading systems and their consistent interrelationships.

Several recent contributions to linguistic scholarship may prove to be very significant in the development of a theoretical model which will be appropriate for elementary school children. We should acknowledge the important critical work of structural linguists such as Charles Fries, Archibald Hill, George Trager, Henry Lee Smith, and C. Lefevre. While concisely isolating the inconsistencies of Latinized English grammar, they stressed the primary importance of speech in forming a descriptive or structural analysis of the language. With David Reed I suggest that the primacy of speech, from the reading point of view, has been overstressed to the point that this approach cannot really hope to offer a suitable model to an elementary curriculum which must acknowledge and teach the importance of reading and writing. Lefevre is present and can speak for himself.

A less extreme position may be found in the definitive transformational analysis developed by Noam Chomsky. Chomsky views grammar as ". . . a device of some sort for producing the sentences of the language . . ." Paul Roberts in particular has woven the generative concept of Chomsky's kernel sentences into the syntactical strand of the recently published Roberts English Series, a set of English textbooks from grades three to nine. A basic assumption of the Roberts Series is that the child by grade three virtually is a functioning grammar of the language, able to produce new sentences he has never before encountered and to understand new sentences he has never before heard or read. The Series unfolds a structured plan to expand and formalize this intuitive awareness of syntax, to mold it into a cognitive linguistic tool.

Recently some in our group have embarked on a research project which is designed to evaluate this Series with students of grades three to six over a three-year period. This type of research should be strongly encouraged in others also, for it may provide a basis of evaluating with children a basic premise of transformational linguistics.

Written English shares with reading the need of an adequate model to describe the sound-symbol correspondences of English. Bloomfield, Fries, and Hall have provided valuable insights in this direction. Hodges and Rudorf, members of a Stanford group-study project under the direct of Dr. Paul Hanna, found that more than 80% of the graphemes of 17,000 English words had consistent phoneme correspondences when stress and positional features were considered. An algorithm for spelling was developed and programmed for the computer processing of the 17,000 words to test how many of the words could be spelled correctly from oral-aural cues alone. Of the total number, 49% were spelled correctly and 37.2% were spelled with only one error.

Three needs:

(1) An adequate model.

(2) Teacher familiarity with the content and methodology prescribed by the model.

(3) Appropriate curriculum materials.

## References

Bloomfield, Leonard. Language (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1933).

Bloomfield, Leonard, and Barnhart, Clarence L. Let's Read, A Linguistic Approach (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961).

Chomsky, Noam. Syntactic Structures ('S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1962).

Fries, Charles. Linguistics and Reading (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963).

Fries, Charles. The Structure of English (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952).

Hall, Robert A. Sound and Spelling in English (New York: Chilton Books, 1961).

Hill, Archibald. An Introduction to Linguistic Structures. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1958).

Reed, David W. "A Theory of Language, Speech, and Writing," Elementary English 42:845-51, December 1965.

Roberts, Paul. English Sentences (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962).

Roberts, Paul. Roberts English Series (grades 3-9) (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966).

Smith, Henry Lee. Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956).

Trager, George L. and Smith, Henry Lee. Outline of English Structure (Norman, Oklahoma: Battenburg Press, 1951).

A series of five articles appearing in Elementary English, May 1965 to January 1966.

# RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LANGUAGE COMPONENT OF ELEMENTARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE-ARTS INSTITUTES

Robert Allen
Teachers College, Columbia University

## Introduction

The recommendations embodied in this paper grow out of my experience with a course entitled "Modern Concepts of Language" offered to elementary school teachers by the Department of Languages and Literature at Teachers College, Columbia University. I have taught the course since its inception several years ago; it is a one-semester linguistically oriented course in English. Many of the students enrolled in the course have themselves been elementary teachers actively engaged in teaching at different grade levels while taking the course; through them I have had constant feedback as to the kinds of things which they found relevant and useful in their own teaching. A few of those who have taken the course have since undertaken doctoral studies in which they have tried out and tested the applications of various linguistic concepts discussed in the course; through my close contact with these doctoral students, I have learned a great deal about what the average elementary school teacher knows--and, more importantly, about what she does not know that she should know.

These recommendations are also based, in part, on the "Guidelines for English in the Preparation Program of Elementary School Teachers and Secondary School English Teachers" drawn up at the First Regional Work Conference of the English Teacher Preparation Study sponsored by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Modern Language Association of America. Since those Guidelines seem particularly pertinent to any discussion of the content of elementary English language-arts institutes, I will quote here, in full, those sections of the Guidelines that pertain to the training of elementary school teachers in the area of "language":

### I. LANGUAGE

### A. Basic Competencies

> Both elementary and secondary school English teachers should have acquired through a systematic study a broad knowledge about language in general and about the present-day English language in particular. This study should include:

phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics of the English language; the theoretical and inductive investigation of the regional, social and functional varieties of English usage; major developments in the history of modern English.

The teacher should have some knowledge of the structure and vocabulary of a language other than English.

The teacher should also be acquainted with the preparation and uses of grammars and dictionaries.

The teacher should be prepared to apply linguistic knowledge to the entire task of teaching English.

The teacher should be familiar with what is known about language learning, with special attention to such aspects as are appropriate to the age-level of the students to be taught.

### B. Elementary

Elementary school teachers should also have some understanding of: the stages through which children pass on the way to the acquisition of a full grammar; the particular problems posed by the English writing system for those learning to read and spell; the integral relationship between language growth and the development of the ability to read and write; and, the linguistic knowledge and theories underlying the various traditional and contemporary approaches to the teaching of beginning reading.

## The History of English and of English Grammars

The content of the language component of an elementary English language-arts institute should include a short, not too-detailed overview of the development of the English language--partly to acquaint the teacher enrolled in the institute with the history of their own language, but more importantly to convince them that the English language (like all other languages) has undergone many changes and that such changes are normal (and, at least in the area of syntax, are derived more often than not from the usage of the educated or prestigious rather than from the usage of the uneducated). No really satisfactory text for this part of the institute course is available, as far as I know; I have used W. Nelson Francis' *The History of English*, now incorporated as Chapter 3 of his *The English Language: An Introduction* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1965). However, Francis does not describe one of the changes in the development of English which has special relevance for elementary English language-arts teachers: I refer to the so-called "Great Vowel Shift," some understanding of which is valuable for teachers intimately concerned with the problems of present-day spelling and pronunciation. First and second grade teachers need to know why the *a* in *mad* in a sentence like *It made me mad* is called a "short" *a* when it is noticeably longer than the *a* in *made*. They also need to know the reasons underlying the rules for doubling in present-day English if they are to be able to teach those rules to their students in a meaningful way rather than merely by rote. /Appropriate chapters from Stuart Robertson's *The Development of Modern English* (second edition, revised by Frederic G. Cassidy; New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954) can be assigned to fill in the lacunae in Francis' pamphlet. Robertson's book includes many examples of words that have changed in their pronunciation, or that are pronounced differently today by speakers of different dialects./

Along with some knowledge of the history of the English language, the teachers in the institute should learn something about the origins both of traditional grammars of English and also of linguistically oriented grammars. For background information about traditional grammars, they should read some book such as Charles C. Fries' *The Teaching of English* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The George Wahr Publishing Company, 1943); for information about the origin and development of structural linguistics, they should read Chapter Two, "Linguistics: The Study of Language," in Fries' *Linguistics and Reading* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963).

## *Graphemic-Phonemic Correspondences (of "Spelling Patterns")*

Elementary school teachers should also read the other chapters in *Linguistics and Reading* because of the importance of what Fries has to say about the teaching of reading. His discussion of "spelling patterns" and of the difference between his own approach to the teaching of reading and a straight phonics approach is particularly relevant. Study of those spelling patterns which involve only single vowel letters (with or without doubling of the following consonant, and with or without a following *e* or *i*) should be related to the discussion of the Great Vowel Shift.

> One type of exercise which I always require of those elementary school teachers in my courses who may be at all involved in the teaching of beginning reading is designed to insure their recognition of "regular spelling patterns." I ask them to write three short, simple stories for first grade children, following the models to be found in the booklet of short

stories in the *Read Along With Me* kit (Robert L. Allen and Virginia F. Allen, *Read Along With Me*; New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964). In such stories, the paragraphs printed in small type (or typed in black) are to be read by the parent or teacher, while the short sentences printed in large boldface type (or typed in red) are to be read by the child. Such stories enable the plot to be carried forward quickly in the paragraphs read by the adult; the sentences read by the child, however, contain only regularly spelled words (with the exception of "a," "the," and "was"). (Other irregularly spelled words are introduced one at a time as needed.) In the first of the three stories, the teachers are supposed to introduce, in the sentences to be read by the child, only one-syllable words that contain the so-called "short" vowel sounds; in the second story, they are expected to introduce only one-syllable words containing both "short" and "long" vowel sounds; in the third story, they may also introduce two-syllable words which are accented on the first syllable *if the first syllable is regularly spelled and contains either a "short" vowel sound or a "long" vowel sound*. In the stories written by teachers, the sentences which are written for the child to read, are used to determine whether or not the teachers understand the concept of "regular spelling patterns," and whether they really know the "short" sounds and the "long" sounds of the five vowel letters.

## Usage and Dialects

English teachers, regardless of the levels on which they teach, should be acquainted with the facts about usage. These may be covered in lectures, or brought to the teachers' attention through required readings in such books as *Teaching English Usage* by Robert C. Pooley (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946) or *American English Grammar* by Charles C. Fries (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940). The last-named book is especially useful; selected passages in it should be listed as "required reading" for all teachers in the institute. The teachers should also be required to read the article "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English" by John S. Kenyon, which first appeared in the October 1948 issue of *College English* (pp. 31-36), and has recently been reprinted in *Readings in Applied English Linguistics,* edited by Harold B. Allen (second edition; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964, pp. 294-301). Additional reading that I have found helpful consists of passages from books on English pronunciation which deal specifically with the reduction of vowel sounds in unaccented syllables and the blending or running together of words in connected discourse. Since books written for teaching English as a foreign language tend to emphasize such reduction and blending, I have often chosen the passages to be read from such books.

In my own work with elementary school and high school English teachers, however, I have found that the mere reading of articles or books about usage does not drive home their significance sufficiently. For this reason, I try to play recordings of different American and British dialects in my courses; I also include, for outside work by the teachers, exercises which require that they look up facts about usage and dialects in the _Linguistic Atlas of the United States_ or in one or another of the books and articles referred to in Harold B. Allen's "The Linguistic Atlases: Our New Resource" (reprinted from the April 1956 issue of _The English Journal_ in Allen's _Readings in Applied English Linguistics_, pp. 212-219) or in Margaret M. Bryant's _Current American Usage_ (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1962). The two books which I have found most useful, however, are _Dialects--U. S. A._ by Jean Malmstrom and Annabel Ashley (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963) and--for reference purposes--_A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage_ by Bergen Evans and Cornelia Evans (New York: Random House, 1957). I regularly require the teachers in my courses to indicate their own personal opinion as to the present "stature" of twenty or twenty-five usage items and then have them look up the facts about each item in the Evans and Evans dictionary. I also assign some such words as _stout_ or _silly_, which I have the teachers look up in the _Oxford English Dictionary_; I ask them to prepare charts showing the different meanings that the word has had from the date of the earliest quotation given in the _O. E. D._ down to the present, giving dates for the first and last quotation cited for every different meaning of sense.

## Other Misconceptions

Among the concepts I have found to be especially difficult to get across to elementary school teachers is that of the influence of a child's own native dialect or language on his recognition and production of different sounds. Many elementary school teachers (and principals) also fail to recognize what a shattering experience it may be for a child to be required to speak only a new, imperfectly-learned language while in school, with penalties for speaking his own language. Again, teachers of beginning reading often cannot believe that discussion of the meanings of words may be relatively unimportant in the initial stages of learning to recognize the grapheme-phoneme correspondences in an unfamiliar orthography. To drive these points home, we require of the secondary school teachers in our own Department who are majoring in the teaching of English as a second language, exposure to a language different from their own, in an attempt to give them some understanding of what their own students have to go through. (For this purpose we make extensive use of prepared tapes in our language laboratory.) And we have tried--but not very successfully--to persuade such teachers to limit themselves to the use of the new language they are learning for a period of several hours, to give them an opportunity to see what it really feels like. We also hope, before too long, to be able to experiment with transcriptions of English in Arabic or Hindi orthography, in order to drive home the point that when a person is trying to learn the printed symbols corresponding to a language he already knows orally, he is not nearly as interested in the meanings of the words printed in the new symbols as he is in the relationship of the new symbols to the sound of his own language.

> At Teachers College we have just instituted a new course in the teaching of standard English to speakers of non-standard dialects of English. This is a methods course which leans heavily on the methods of teaching English as a foreign language. The decision to offer such a course was made as the result of consultant work performed by members of our staff at Claflin University in Orangeburg, South Carolina, where Dr. San-su Lin--a graduate of our Department--directed a project sponsored by the Office of Education in which English-as-a-second-language techniques were used to teach standard English to the students entering the University who spoke some non-standard dialect. Some such course as the one now being offered at Teachers College--or at least some of the content of the course--might be included in the language component of an elementary English language-arts institute for teachers who will be teaching children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

## "Structural Linguistics"

Since most of the linguistically oriented textbooks now available are based in large part on Trager and Smith's phonological analysis of English and on Fries' syntactic analysis, the teachers in the institute should become acquainted with these varieties of "structural linguistics." A book like Paul Roberts' Understanding English (New York: Harper and Row, 1954) is well suited for this purpose; it is well-written and provides a relatively simple introduction to the concept of immediate-constituent analysis, to Fries' use of substitution frames for the identification of different word classes, and to the kind of phonological transcription based on the work of Trager and Smith which one finds in many articles in such periodicals as the *English Journal* and *Elementary English*. In addition, Roberts' book gives much useful information about language in general and about the English language in particular.

> I should state here, however, that I do not believe that teachers in the institute should study Roberts' *Understanding English* intensively, nor do I believe that they should teach their own students the kind of phonological and syntactical analysis described in that book. Their reading in Roberts' text would be more for their own information than for any practical use they could make of its contents. There are too many English constructions to which immediate-constituent analysis cannot be applied, except arbitrarily; Fries' substitution frames are primarily frames for words and tend to reinforce the emphasis on words which is one of the chief weaknesses of traditional grammar. The study of English phonology is of less value--at least in elementary school grades--than the study of other, more recent approaches to the analysis of English sentences. Teachers mislead their students if they suggest that phonological signals will help them to distinguish between the structure of two such sentences as *Is that girl writing a letter*? and *Is that girl writing a letter your sister*? when the students encounter such sentences on the printed page. And yet one must be able to recognize the difference in structure between those two sentences if one is to be able to read them intelligently. Reading them aloud would not necessarily reveal the difference between them; indeed, the manner in which a person reads a sentence aloud reveals the analysis of the sentence he has already made. Most children, it has been said, have already mastered the phonological structure of their native language by the time they are five or six. There is little need, therefore, it seems to me, to teach them all about stresses, pitches, and terminal contours. *Teachers* should have their attention called to such things, however, so they can make use of insights gleaned from this sort of knowledge on those occasions when such insights may help in clearing up ambiguities, or in the discussion of prosody when studying poetry. Such information may also be of value to teachers who are teaching some standard dialect of English to non-native speakers of English

or to speakers of some non-standard dialect--or even to children who have speech problems. (It appears, for example, that teachers of deaf children have found detailed descriptions of English phonology, as well as a thorough understanding of the articulatory processes, of real value in their teaching.)

## Other Approaches to Linguistic Analysis

Two other approaches to linguistic analysis hold greater promise for the teaching of reading and writing in the elementary grades: the transformational theory postulated by Noam Chomsky and the tagmemic theory first postulated by Kenneth Pike. Of the two, the latter may well be of potentially greater significance for teachers in the earlier grades, although elementary school teachers should be informed about both. In order to become acquainted with the basic concepts of both approaches, the teachers in the institute should be required to read some such book as Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English by Owen Thomas (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), as well as An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax by Benjamin Elson and Velma Pickett (Santa Ana, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1962), especially Parts I and II. (The new Roberts English Series published by Harcourt, Brace and World makes use of transformational concepts and symbols; it is intended for use in grades 3 through 6. No textbooks based on tagemic grammar are available as yet, although one such text has been tried out in mimeographed form in several schools in Tennessee and, hopefully, will be available in printed form before long.)

It has been my experience that most elementary school teachers are woefully ignorant of grammar--of any kind of grammar, even traditional grammar. And yet those who will be teaching in the fifth and sixth grades--and possibly, also those who will be teaching in the fourth grade--will probably be expected to teach their students some grammar in connection with the language-arts program in their schools. Unless the teachers themselves are taught a better kind of grammar, such grammar teaching in the schools will consist largely of drill in the learning of rules (often inaccurate rules) relating to various usage items, of the memorization of definitions such as those for the "eight parts of speech," and of attempts at identifying the part of speech to which one or another word belongs. Unfortunately, most if not all structural descriptions of English also tend to emphasize words rather than larger constructions, as do the few samples of tagmemic analysis of English that have appeared in print. And yet more than anything else, I believe, fourth and fifth grade students need to learn to identify the larger units which go together to make up English sentences, the units which I call "sectors." There is already some evidence to suggest that the ability to identify the sectors in a sentence will, more than anything else, help a child to recognize the structure of a sentence and thus to read the sentence intelligently. There is also reason to believe that students can learn to write more effectively by gaining a recognition of the different kinds of sentence-units and of the different positions which they may occupy, added to practice in making up such units and in manipulating them and shifting them around. For these reasons, a considerable portion of my course at Teachers College is devoted to a study of the structure of English sentences.

An important component of this grammar derives from Fries' emphasis on "layers of structure," that is, on different levels within the hierarchy of constructions that make up a sentence. Instead of working from words up to sentences, however, this grammar starts with sentences (and even larger units) and works down to words and morphemes. (The "parts of speech" are among the last things to be discussed.) The function of a unit is examined on the level on which it forms part of a larger construction; the unit itself is then extracted from the larger construction and examined for its form on the next lower level, where it no longer makes up part of the larger construction.

> It has been claimed that the only way to produce good writers among our students is to have them read and read and read. Reading alone, however, will not produce a good writer. It seems more likely that a reader becomes an effective writer only when, either consciously or unconsciously, he somehow becomes aware of the devices used by the writers whose works he reads. Some students seem to be able to develop this kind of awareness without special assistance, but the average student cannot. Although much of the emphasis in English classes fifty years ago was on examining (by means of parsing and diagramming) English sentences within the framework of a Latin-based grammar, nevertheless such examining did at least force students to look more closely at the construction of English sentences. For many students, the kind of grammar that was used in such grammatical analysis interfered with their recognition of what the

writers they studied were actually doing with the language. But for some students--students who were able to focus on the English in spite of the grammar--such analysis did seem to produce a better recognition of the many different devices that the English language places at the command of the writer able to make use of them. There is some justification for the belief that with the aid of sector analysis teachers will be able to alert even average students to the different ways in which skillful writers make use of such devices and can help such students to make greater use of these devices themselves, _consciously_ rather than haphazardly. *

## _Other Materials_

Regardless of what kind of grammar the teachers in the institute are taught (to prepare them for teaching it themselves), the grammar should be based upon what children--even young children--already know about the structure of their language, in order to relate the grammar teaching to their own feeling for the language. Children should be helped to recognize the fact that writing more mature sentences involves the _extension_ and _expansion_ of the kind of English they already write, not the learning of a new and totally unrelated kind of English. The teachers themselves should be made aware of the amount of English--both vocabulary and grammar--that their students already know, on each level, even if only unconsciously; to this end, their attention should be called to such studies as Ruth G. Strickland's _The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children_ (Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, Vol. 38, No. 4, July, 1962) and Walter D. Loban's _The Language of Elementary School Children_ (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963).

Two other books which I myself would call to the attention of elementary school teachers are the _Thorndike Century Beginning Dictionary_ (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1945), especially the section entitled "How to Use Your Dictionary," and _Better Work_

---

* Robert L. Allen, "Descriptive Linguistics: Implications for the Teaching of Reading and Writing," in Fred Guggenheim and Corinne Guggenheim (eds.), _New Frontiers in Education_ (New York: Grune and Stratton, in press).

Habits by Rachel Salisbury (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1942). Although there are more recent dictionaries for elementary school children than the Thorndike Century Beginning Dictionary, Edward L. Thorndike's step-by-step explanation is still one of the best introductions to the use of a dictionary that I know of. Thorndike discusses such things as different ways of defining, alphabetical order, the interpretation of diagrams, the way to determine the approximate size of an animal from its picture, the selection of the appropriate definition (out of several definitions), the use of the properly inflected form of a verb, the use of the pronunciation key and of diacritical marks, the difference between spelling and pronunciation (including a discussion of silent letters), syllables, accents and the unstressed schwa sound, homographs and homophones, words with more than one pronunciation, and roots and affixes. (Unfortunately the Thorndike Century Beginning Dictionary does not give the derivations of words, so that there is no discussion of etymology.)

> The study of the Thorndike Century Beginning Dictionary should be related to the chapter on dictionaries in Roberts' Understanding English, in which he discusses the use of dictionaries and also gives something of their history. As supplementary reading the teachers might be asked to read the articles on dictionaries and dictionary-making in Allen's Readings in Applied English Linguistics.

Salisbury's Better Work Habits does not properly belong in the language component of an elementary English language-arts institute since it is intended for use in the high school rather than in the elementary school; futhermore, it does not deal with language as language but rather with the organization of ideas and concepts. However, until a similar book is written for elementary school students, this book is still valuable for its detailed exposition of an excellent method of introducing students to the principles of outlining and organizing. Salisbury presents students with many lists - first of words, then of phrases, and still later of full sentences - which they are to reorganize and group together in logical groupings. In later exercises they are asked to write headings for the different groups.

I have said nothing here about books or articles dealing with the psychology of language learning or with the stages children pass through in their verbal development. I try to bring such insights as I can into my own lectures, but I do not feel competent enough to judge as to the reliability of published materials that deal with language learning. It is my hope that John Carroll may be able to recommend several basic readings for elementary school teachers in this area. I do know that kindergarten and first grade teachers must be alert to the very great handicaps which small children bring with them--a handicap from which they may never be able to recover--if they come from homes in which they have not been listened to, in which they were never given the opportunity to chatter, to "play" with language, like normal children.

## The Use of Problems

One device which I have found to be especially helpful in my work with elementary school--and high school--teachers has been the assignment of problems relating to language which they are asked to do as homework. These are problems which I prepared originally for a group of junior high school students who were involved in an experimental program in problem solving; I have found the working out of the problems of value to teachers as well, especially since they are problems which the teachers can use with their own students. The problems present relevant data (for example, all the possible verb forms and verb phrases which can be derived from a single verb, or long lists of present participles and of past participles in *-ed* which involve the doubling or non-doubling of consonants); the teachers are then asked to work out for themselves the rules for doubling in English, or to determine whether English really does have only six tenses--and if not, how many tenses it does have (and under what definition of "tense"). Problems like these, in conjunction with the exercises related to usage matters described above, are more effective in alerting teachers to some of the facts about present-day English than any amount of reading by itself.

## Epilogue

But whatever the materials that may be selected for use in an institute for elementary teachers, the class discussion should at all times be conducted in such a way as to focus attention upon those portions of the assigned materials that can be applied to classroom teaching. Much of the content of the texts recommended in this paper extends beyond the interests and needs of elementary school teachers. The discussion in class should help participants to see how the concepts that are introduced in the readings and lectures can have practical relevance to the teaching of children. Hopefully, some of the studies that have already been written describing ways in which linguistically oriented materials have been adapted and used with elementary school children can be made available in one form or another for use in elementary institutes. Teachers enrolled in such institutes should be required to prepare materials for use with children on those grade levels that they themselves teach--materials in which they demonstrate their grasp of these new concepts. (In summer institutes designed for teachers of English as a second language, provision is often made for actual classes in which the participants are given a chance to try out new materials and lesson plans which they have prepared. Similar classes might be included as part of the language component of elementary English language-arts institutes.)

In setting up the programs for such institutes, directors should take care to provide for constant feedback, so that the staff may be quickly alerted to problems caused by lecturers who fail to communicate with the participants. An institute which neglects to take such precautions can set back the cause of linguistics by arousing hostility among the very teachers who most need the kind of help linguists can supply. Linguists who have never visited elementary school classes--or, at best, have had no contact with elementary school teachers--would probably be among the worst resource persons for a language-arts institute. The best kind of a staff for such an institute would be made up largely of experienced teachers who have had intensive training in linguistics. Unfortunately, an institution wishing to submit a proposal for such an institute may feel--probably with some justification--that its proposal is more likely to be accepted and funded if several "big" names are included, at least in the roster of consultants. One real problem facing the director of such an institute is that of making his consultants just what the name implies: persons to be consulted rather than persons to be used as lecturers or teachers in the program itself. The number of experienced elementary school and high school teachers who have had a sound training in linguistics is increasing; such teachers would probably be the best ones to recruit for the teaching staff of an elementary language-arts institute. College teachers who have had direct contact with language programs in elementary schools--or, better yet, professors in teacher-training colleges who have worked with elementary school teachers--would also make valuable resource persons.

However, there may be some value in including one-shot lectures or small-group discussions with well-known linguists--but any linguists invited for this purpose should be selected from among the relatively small group of linguists who know how to communicate with laymen. The other linguists, no matter how stimulating, should be reserved for the graduate courses in linguistics in which the graduates of the elementary English language-arts institutes will hopefully enroll at some later date.

## REPORT OF THE LANGUAGE COMMITTEE

### Outline

- 0. The structure of an institute: two intersecting models
- 1. The componential model: three-part division
    - 1.1 A basic understandings component
    - 1.2 A basic skills component
    - 1.3 An aesthetic-creativity component
- 2. The operational model
    - 2.1 A tentative organization into temporal blocks
    - 2.2 Staff: composition, use, problem of selection
    - 2.3 The advisability of the K-6 institute

0. The language committee has attempted to evolve a report which will both (a) state the consensus of the members on the requisite SUBJECT MATTER to be provided in summer institutes for elementary school teachers, and (b) at least adumbrate a kind of ORGANIZATION which will make practicable the presentation of this subject matter within the short span of time occupied by such institutes. (The committee did not concern itself with such atypical frameworks as the part-time institute conducted during the school year and the two-summer sequential institute. The former would seem by definition to require highly specialized local planning rather than general guidelines; the latter appeared, to the few members who commented on it privately, unworkable and to some extent unfair to the clientele, in that by selecting only former participants for the second summer it would limit the accessibility of training.)

As a result, the committee agreed upon the presentation, by means of this report, of a pair of intersecting models for the conduct of a summer institute for elementary teachers. They are (a) a COMPONENTIAL MODEL for the selection and ordering of subject matter; (b) an OPERATIONAL MODEL for the structuring of the daily and weekly progression of the institute. These models are characterized as intersecting because, as will appear, there is no simple parallelism or one-to-one correspondence between the elements of the two models.

Both models are described below. The descriptions, it is hoped, will have a sufficiently high degree of generality to make them easily adaptable to widely variant local needs. However, the specific detail of the description should indicate the extent of the committee members' concern with and knowledge of the actualities of their subject and of school. It should, in fact, be possible to set up at least one institute which incorporates directly most if not all of the committee's recommendations, and which would work.

1. The componential model is designed to classify the kinds of concepts, attitudes, and practices which an institute in language arts for elementary teachers would want to provide as learnings or to consider as instructional devices. It has a tripartite division into a basic understandings component, a basic skills component, and an aesthetic-creativity component.

It should be mentioned here that the first task undertaken by the committee was to define the problem of the elementary institute as RETRAINING OF THE GENERAL SPECIALIST, and to consider in this light three alternatives for the structure of content in an institute. The retraining of experienced teachers by subject-matter specialists involves the creation of intellectual multiplicity in a teacher's approach to her work: new ways of doing things and new things to do. The elementary teacher, as a general specialist in the self-contained classroom as most school systems provide for it, already has a multiplicity of duties with regard to teaching the uses of language: she must deal with speech, oral composition, practical writing, spelling, handwriting, to name only some. This problem defined, our alternatives were stated thus:

(1) Should we recommend or plan an institute in which the sole instructional emphasis is on linguistics?

(2) Should we recommend or plan an institute employing the "General English" conventional tripartite structure of language-literature-composition, and concentrate on organizing the instruction in the language segment of such a structure alone?

(3) Should we recommend or plan an institute which has an introduction to the nature of language and of English as its major overt theoretical component, and one or more additional components constructed around classroom skills and activities and integrated with the theoretical component?

(1) was rejected because the potential participants are as a group not sufficiently specialized in interest, preparation, or professional duties. (2) was not pursued because the compartmentalization, it was felt, would artificialize the subject matter and necessitate a workshop which might lead the participants' thinking into an overemphasis on pedagogical gimmickry. (3), as may be surmised from the description of the program so far, is what was chosen.

1.1. The basic understandings component is planned to comprise an introduction to the nature and uses of language in general and to the structure and history of the English language. A sequentially organized outline of the content of this component follows, with occasional explanatory comments. The outline is suggestive only, and the degree of emphasis given to any subcomponent is left to the discretion of individual directors and faculty members who may make use of this model.

- I. Nature of Language: language as system

- II. History and Development of the English language
  - A. Language variation
    - 1. Diachronic
      - a. Old English
      - b. Middle English
      - c. Modern English
    - 2. Synchronic
      - a. Regional dialects
      - b. Social levels
      - c. Functional varieties
  - B. History of grammars

    This does not represent an artificial "advanced placement" of part of the subject matter described in IV. C. What will be taught here is not the manipulation of any kind of grammatical analysis, but simply a reasonably detailed comparison of the assumptions and methodologies of these two large groups of grammars.
    - 1. Traditional grammars
    - 2. Descriptive grammars

- III. The system of spoken English
  - A. Phonology
    - 1. Physiology of speech production
      - a. Phonetics
      - b. Speech disorders

        Sufficient material will be presented here to help the participants distinguish between disorders which need to be referred to a specialist in speech therapy and those which can be ameliorated by the classroom teacher's aid.
    - 2. Phonemics
      - a. Segmental
      - b. Suprasegmental
  - B. Morphology
  - C. Morphophonemics
  - D. Spoken discourse and its syntactic organization

IV. System of written English
  A. Writing systems
    Although the placement indicates that this area is not part of the study of "language in general," it was the committee's thinking that it would be beneficial for the participants to examine graphemic systems for languages other than English, as well as divergent systems (e. g., i. t. a.) for representing the English language.
  B. Relationship between spoken and written English
    1. Spelling
    2. Reading
    3. Writing
  C. Overview of different models of the grammar of written English
    1. Detailed study of one such model
    2. Supplementary use of other models
      Each institute director or faculty member teaching this subject area will want to choose his model for detailed study--whether Trager-Smith, Fries-Francis, transformational-generative, or tagmemic--on the basis of his own understanding of the nature of English structure and the particular emphasis of the institute. Those following our institute model rather closely might want to consider the following suggested criteria for selection of a central or major grammar of written English:
        Is its analysis of English adequate?
        How significant is it for the production of further texts--pedagogically, for the encouragement of composition?
        How accessible is it? Are introductory textbooks, suitable for institute classes, in existence? Are there published materials embodying its principles that can be used in, or adapted to, the elementary classroom?

V. Lexicography
  A. The making of dictionaries
  B. The uses of dictionaries

VI. Nature of Language: language as communication
  At the close of the institute, the work in the basic understandings component returns to a consideration of language in general, but this time to its uses rather than its form.
  A. Psychology of language

B. Language acquisition
    1. Learning a first language
    2. Learning a second language or dialect

C. The affective uses of language
Under this heading are subsumed such matters as literary employments of language; the definition and classification of "style"; theories of modeled composition; standards for oral performance of poetry; etc.

1.2. The basic skills component is not envisioned by the committee as a separable subject area for instructional treatment. In most states, what society regards as essential performance capacities to be mastered in the elementary grades are given a workable chronological arrangement by professional educators which is published as scope and sequence charts in manuals put out by state departments of education. The basic skills of kindergarten through sixth grade are consequently a "given" in the componential model.

How then are they to be treated? They can be integrated into the elements of the operational model by frequent consideration of their linguistic and cognitive justifications in the understandings section, and frequent attempts at development of assignments to further their acquisition, worked out in the practicum (see 2.1 below). Thus the skill of handwriting can become a focal point for intellectually and pedagogically significant discussion when graphemic systems are taught in the understandings section; while in the practicum the participants can explore the uses of transliteration (e.g., representation of English words in the Greek alphabet) and ciphers (e.g., numeral and geometrical codes) for exercise materials to further pupil comprehension of the relationships between language, speech, and writing.

1.3. The aesthetic-creativity component has as its concern the USES of language, just as the basic understandings component has as a major aim the exposition of language's SYSTEMATIC NATURE. Where the analytic segment of the basic understandings component might, for example, be devoted to a study of a tagmemic model for the description of English, a corresponding portion of the aesthetic-creativity component would be dedicated to the consideration of a program in oral and written composition making use of tagmemic discoveries about the structure of discourses larger than the sentence. The exploration of English phonology in the basic understandings component could lead to a study of the exploitation of segmentals and suprasegmentals (alliteration, rhyme, meter) in quality verse for children, which in turn could lead to plans for oral performance of poetry in the classroom, to be engaged in by both teacher and children. We might sum up by saying that this component takes as its province the development of children's RESPONSE to the affective use of language and their PERFORMANCE as individual manipulators of language.

2. The operational model is for a summer institute of eight weeks' duration, with class work carried on for five days in each week. A schedule chart at the end of 2.1 will show the representation of time in the average class week and day.

2.1. Four elements were thought to be necessary in the operational model to provide most thoroughly for the theory and practical applications that can be derived from the componential scheme: an understandings section; an applications section or practicum; a demonstration class; and consultative meetings with guest specialists.

The understandings section would be very largely coextensive with the basic understandings component in the componential model, with some interposition of the basic skills component as has been noted in 1.2. It should meet for two hours a day throughout the institute, to insure that the extensive body of knowledge outlined in 1.1 be presented and assimilated with reasonable adequacy. Preferably it should meet in the morning, when participants' minds are fresh.

The practicum, or applications section, has been given these alternative appellations in an effort to avoid some of the conventional associations of the term "workshop." Participants should not be obliged to produce only lesson plans and other materials intended for direct transfer to the classroom teaching situation. Especially at the beginning of the institute, use of practicum time for the working out of exercises related to the teachers' studies in the basic understandings component could be very useful. A transliteration or code problem like those discussed in 1.2, for example, could be solved by teachers during practicum time. The practicum should be somewhat flexible to allow for intersection with the consultations; it might be omitted one day of the five-day week, but it should otherwise be considered as operating for two hours in the afternoon of a normal class day.

The demonstration class can also be scheduled somewhat irregularly; we suggest its omission during at least the first week and possibly the first two weeks of the institute, while the participants are still grappling wholemindedly with the questions posed in the understandings section. It should last for no more than an hour (and maybe less, since elementary school children are involved) in the morning, and might profitably occupy only three or four days a week.

Consultant visits should take place in the afternoons and can be arranged to intersect with, lead into, or even occasionally replace the practicum session. The subject matter suitable for consultant treatment and the optimally productive use of consultant personnel in the institute are discussed briefly in 2. 2 below.

The chart below suggests a temporal organization of the institute instruction, as a flow movement through eight weeks and as the content of an average single day.

WEEK 1

| Hour | M | T | W | T | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. | Understandings Section | | | | |
| LUNCH | | | | | |
| 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. | Practicum | | | | |

WEEKS 2 THROUGH 7

| Hour | M | T | W | T | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8:30 a. m. to 10:30 a. m. | Understandings Section | | | | |
| 10:45 a. m. to 11:45 a. m. | Demonstration class | —— | Demonstration class | —— | Demonstration class |
| | L | U | N | C | H |
| 1:30 p. m. to 2:30 p. m. | Consultant | Consultant | Consultant | —— | —— |
| 2:30 p. m. to 4:30 p. m. | Practicum | Practicum | Practicum | Possible omission on Thursday | Practicum |

Afternoon schedules are flexible as indicated in text of report. However, it is often a courtesy to consultants to arrange their 2 or 3 appearances for early in the week, when possible. Their contributions can often then stimulate practicum discussion and work for later in the week.

WEEK 8

| M | T | W | T | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Same arrangement as for week 1, except that practicum meets M T W and T. | | | | |

2.2. A major problem for the director of any institute for elementary school teachers is the discovery and recruitment of what Raven McDavid has called "middle level" faculty and consultant personnel. These are people who are thoroughly conversant with subject matter as it has been described here and with research, both recent and established, in these areas, and who are also thoroughly capable of conversing with the general specialists of grade school about such things without lapsing into pedantry or intellectual endogamy. Robert Allen made the suggestion, which the committee believes to merit careful consideration, that the director seek to obtain, for his full-time teaching staff, experienced elementary teachers (or college and university faculty who have been elementary teachers) who have extensive graduate or institute training in linguistics, cognitive theory, literary criticism, rhetorical theory and practice, etc.

The rationale of consultant selection and the proper use to be made of consultants in the institute program are problems of sufficient universality to need a note here. Consultants are of most value when they are chosen to represent and to explore areas too specialized to merit coverage in course-size components, but yet of enough conceptual or practical importance to the institute's aims to deserve presentation by a competent specialist. Subjects which consultants can be used for might include (a) the description of a successful program in modeled composition for the elementary school, by one who has taught in or helped prepare such a program; (b) an overview of problems and theories of teaching a prestige dialect of English as a second dialect to the culturally deprived, by a language arts supervisor from an inner-city situation; (c) an introduction to the increasing number of quality children's books which contain sympathetic characters representative of minority groups, by a school librarian from a school with a culturally different population.

Consultants seem to perform most effectively in the give-and-take of conferences with interested teacher-participants who actively question and comment, not in a formalized situation which attempts to replicate that of a lecture class. It is for this reason that afternoon appearances, in or near the afternoon time segment allotted to the practicum, are recommended for consultants. A meaningful sequential arrangement of consultations, so far as is practicable, will make it easier for the participants to formulate significant questions and engage in useful discussion with the consultants.

A final caution: This is perhaps the most idealistic section of this report. Don't expect to find staff members like these very easily.

2.3. Directors may be considering whether to plan a K-6 institute, or one for either K-3 or 4-6, or one institute with separate tracks for primary and intermediate teacher-participants, or perhaps one with a more specialized grade range than any indicated here. It is the committee's opinion that an institute of less that K-6 scope is inadvisable except in circumstances where precise local needs make a narrower focus necessary; e.g., Texas Western College's summer 1966 institute in English as a foreign language for teachers of K-3, operating in an area with a large percentage of non-English-speaking children in the primary school population. In all other circumstances, a narrower focus would serve chiefly to isolate elementary teachers into artificial small groups; and the self-contained classroom is isolation aplenty in this trade.

G. Thomas Fairclough
Chairman
For the Language Committee

## LANGUAGE

### Annotated Bibliography

The annotations in the following bibliography are made by Raven McDavid, G. Thomas Fairclough, and Robert Allen; the authorship of each annotation is indicated by the initials m, f, and a.

Allen, Robert L. *English Grammars and English Grammar*. To appear 1966.

a The first tagmemic grammar of English for elementary (and) secondary school teachers.

*The American College Dictionary*, both first and second editions.

Baugh, A. C. *History of the English Language* 2nd Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Company, 1958.

m Standard reference work, particularly good as far as the external history of the language is concerned. Not very good about structural change.

Bloomfield, Leonard *Language.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.

m Bible of American structural tradition. It is very closely written. You'd better be sure you understand the last sentence on page 97 and all sentences before it before you go to the first sentence on page 98. A number of Bloomfield's observations about language seem dated but it remains a significant and productive book.

a The chapters on comparative and historical linguistics are available as a separate paperback.

Carroll, John B. *Language and Thought*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

a A basic summary of information on the present status of knowledge concerning the interrelationships of linguistics and psychology.

Elson, Benjamin and Velma Pickett *An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax.* Santa Ana, Calif.: Summer Inst. of Linguistics, 1962.

f An introductory text embodying tagmemic principles and methods. English is frequently used as a source of examples. Probably somewhat more comprehensible for elementary teachers than other existing works of this school.

Evans, Bergen and Cornelia Evans A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage. New York: Random House, 1957.

a Perhaps the best reference dictionary now available for facts about various usage items.

Fries, Charles, C. American English Grammar. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1940, (sponsored by National Council of Teachers of English).

m Perhaps the best study of the problem of usage differences; chapters one through four and thirteen are the most important. The intervening chapters may be dated by changes in the language and in the structure of American society.

a A very important book from the point of view of the research design.

m The first thoroughgoing example of an objective approach to the realities of usage differenences.

Fries, Charles C. Linguistics and Reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

m I think the first two chapters are very useful: One is history of reading (instruction) methods and the second is a survey of the history of linguistic methods. I suppose this is the most systematic description of the spelling method of approach to reading.

a (Slightly different approach to the spelling approach) is to be found in Read Along with Me by Robert L. Allen and Virginia F. Allen. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

m Also Leonard Bloomfield and Barnhart Let's Read. Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1961. (And separate fascicles based on this book published by Clarence L. Barnhart, Bronxville, New York.)

Fries, Charles C. The Teaching of English. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The George Wahr Publishing Company, 1943.

a The best available discussion of the history of English grammars.

Gleason, H. A., Jr., Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, 2nd Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

m Probably the most successful introductory linguistics text in the English speaking world. It is not primarily a text for English but useful examples come out of it. Also accompanied by a workbook which is important.

Gleason, H. A., Jr., Linguistics and English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

m An excellent book but there is the peril of not getting beyond diagramming; the only text book for many institutes.

a Excellent discussion of the historical background of traditional grammar and structural grammar and syntax.

Hall, Edward T. *The Hidden Dimension.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

m A recent summary of Hall's position.

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language.* Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett, 1961 (pb).

m About the non-linguistic forces in human communication; readable and provocative. To be used as supplementary materials.

Halliday, McIntosh, Strevens *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1964.

f A British book, written from a neo-Firthian point of view and consequently in some sections too far removed from the condition of American teachers. Two sections, however, are of great value: chapter 4, "The Users and Uses of Language," with its very intelligent discussion of social-situational style, or 'register'; and chapter 8, "Studying the Native Language," which mounts one of the most humanely cultured attacks in existence against prescriptivist snobbery.

Hill, Archibald A. *Introduction to Language Structure: From Sound to Sentence in English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958.

m "Archbishop Hill's Exegesis of the gospel according to St. George" or "a Hill of a way to Tragerize English." Hill's book is an expansion of the Trager-Smith; it is not milk for babes--it is not something to be used as a text for teachers or even advanced teachers, but is something that you cannot ignore.

a One has to admire Archibald Hill's rigorous application of one approach to linguistic analysis, but in the end one can't help but ask, "So what?"

m If he had not tried, then we would not have been in the position to see the limitations of the Trager system. Somebody had to do it.

f Rarely used as a textbook. A useful supplementary reading to display the successes and failures of an uncompromising phonologically-based grammar of American English. The appendices on Eskimo and Latin can be profitably examined for methodology of description. The remarks on literary language are suggestive.

Hockett, Charles F. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

m The latest and perhaps the last attempt to include all of linguistics in one set of covers.

a Not suitable for elementary course but O. K. for school reference shelf.

Jespersen, Otto *Essentials of English Grammar*. Tuscaloosa: Alabama University Press, 1965.

m It is an influential if idiosyncratic analysis of English; many insights into the language that have not been seen since.

a These are a sort of a condensation of his 7-volume Modern English Grammar.

Jespersen, Otto *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1919. (paperback).

m The theories somewhat dated. Oriented toward British English, but well written; brief historical treatise.

Joos, Martin "The Five Clocks," Chapters 1-5 in Dudley Bailey, ed., *Essays on Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

f A maddening, delightful, intelligent, alert, accurate, and stylistically meritorious dissertation on style or register in American English. As tonic for real-life Misses Fidditch as for the one who plays female lead in the book.

Joos, Martin *The English Verb*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

f Useful both for method and for result; shows readers what you can do to real data (and what "real data" is!) in order to arrive at viable conclusions about a carefully delimited segment of the English grammatical system.

Kenyon, John S. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English." and other articles appearing in Harold B. Allen's *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, 2nd edition anthology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

f The Kenyon article is a significant early work in the study of American social dialects and registers. The entire anthology, because of its consistent intertwining of fact and pedagogy, is strongly recommended for use in institutes.

*Language and Language Learning*. A special issue of *The Harvard Educational Review*, spring 1964 (to be published as a separate volume, 1966).

f A valuable set of articles in such diverse but related fields as child acquisition of language; psycholinguistics; evaluation of grammars; and transformational theory. Should be on the reading list of every English institute for elementary teachers.

Loban, Walter D. *The Language of Elementary School Children.* Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.
f Like Strickland (see below), a major work in the area of children's language and its development.

Malmstrom, Jean and Annabel Ashley *Dialects--U. S. A.* Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963. (adaptation of Francis' chapter 9, *The Structure of American English.*)

McDavid, R. I., Jr., *American Social Dialects.* (pamphlet) Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

McDavid, R. I., Jr., *Sense and Nonsense about American Dialects.* New York: M. L. A., 1966.
f The above three works complement each other well. *Dialects--U. S. A.* provides valuable exercises and projects for teachers, to help further their understanding of regional dialects. McDavid has been the American dialectologist most responsible for creating an informed educational concern with social dialects, and these two articles are important statements of fact and purpose.

McDavid, Raven and Evelyn Gott *Our Changing Language.* The McGraw-Hill Book Company, Webster Division, Missouri, 1965. One long playing record; historical passages and 13 specimens of contemporary American English dialect.

National Council of Teachers of English *American Dialect Recording* which is expected to appear some time soon. This will include six passages by adults including reading passages and free discourse.

Francis, W. Nelson *The History of English.* Now incorporated as chapters three of his *The English Language: An Introduction.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1965.
a Excellent. One summary of the history of the English language which distinguishes between the developments in the language and the relationship of these developments to the history of the English people.

*The Oxford English Dictionary* 13 Volumes, 1888-1930.
m The historical dictionary of English--the greatest historical dictionary ever published.

Pyles, Thomas The Growth and Development of the English Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

m Particularly good on the modern period.

Quirk, Randolph The Use of English. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1963.

m A very readable and perceptive understanding of English, especially of the varieties in which English may be employed.

Roberts, Paul English Syntax. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

m A text book for high school students embodying the principles of transformational grammar and programmed learning and also valuable for elementary school teachers.

Roberts, Paul The Roberts English Series, Books three through six. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

a Series embodying some elements of transformational grammar, intended for elementary school classes.

f An analysis of the English language is correlated with the study of quality verse and prose, not all of it intended for a child audience. An interesting experiment.

Roberts, Paul Understanding English. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

a The best overview of structural linguistics for teachers.

Robertson, Stewart and Frederic G. Cassidy The Development of Modern English. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

m Cassidy's familiarity with modern linguistics and dialect differences has made a good (older) book; very useful for the present-day teacher.

Robins, R. H. General Linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1964.

f This new British textbook has, as is to be expected, neo-Firthian overtones, but it is sufficiently nonsectarian to be a useful introductory work this side of the Atlantic. It is attractively and clearly written.

Lin, San-Su C. Pattern Practice in English for Speakers of Non-Standard Dialects. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

m For teachers who are working with children of different cultural backgrounds.

Sapir, Edward *Language.* Harvest paperback, 1921.

m Probably the most readable book in existence. Has to be used selectively. It is very provocative when used by the right teacher. It is quite inspiring.

a Sapir *could* write English.

f Can provide very useful supplementary readings at the onset of an institute, because of the grace and relatively non-technical nature of the language.

Corbin and Crosby *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged.* The task force report. Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

m This deals more with the general social matrix than with the specifics of language and is uneven in spots but is certainly something that should be available as a reference.

f Any institute with a focus - primary or secondary - on deprivation will need numerous copies for its reference shelf. Suggested programs and other recommendations are not always presented in an illuminating or linguistically sophisticated manner, but there is nothing to match it for concern with classroom actualities, and one masterful lesson (pp. 115-116) can be of almost unlimited value.

Shuy, Roger, ed. *Social Dialects and Language Learning.* (Pamphlet) Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

m A report of a conference on one kind of problem confronting the English teacher. A very good editorial job, particularly editing out the mish-mash. The first general public grappling of the problem in a number of communities in the western hemisphere where the social differences in the language practices are such as to create critical problems in the classroom.

Sledd, James H. and Wilma Ebbitt *Dictionaries and THAT Dictionary.* Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1962.

m I don't think this should be the center of a course. However, it does pull together four or five things: a good overview of our dictionary making; a good summary of criticisms of the Merriam 3rd; and a good perspective of the language attitudes of the culturally advantaged but linguistically uninformed.

a Makes more sense if read after the chapters on dictionaries in Paul Roberts' *Understanding English.*

m Or if the person using it is conversant with dictionary materials. The one big advantage of this book is its emphasis on construction of dictionaries.

Smith, Henry Lee, Jr. *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.

m Usable as an orientation to phonological structure, attractive because of its literacy and urbanity.

The new *Standard College Dictionary*, 1963. (Introductory materials.)

f The prefatory essays in the text edition make this a valuable reference, especially Wilson's "English Grammar and the Grammar of English."

Stewart, William, ed. *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English.* Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

m Papers on particular problems of the disadvantaged.

f A linguistically sound and pedagogically forward-looking publication on a topic of increasing national concern.

Strickland, Ruth G. *The Language of Elementary School Children: Its relationship to the language of reading text books and the quality of reading of select children.* Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, Volume 38, Number 4, July, 1962.

Thomas, Owen *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

m It is the best pedagogical interpretation of transformational grammar.

*Thorndike Century Beginning Dictionary*. Scott Foresman and Company, 1945.

a Especially the section "How to Use a Dictionary," by Edward L. Thorndike.

Trager, George L. and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. *Outline of English Structure.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

m If Bloomfield is the Old Testament of structuralism, this is perhaps the Talmud. They were very influential in the 1950's. My feeling is that this should not be used uncritically; it is most detailed on matters of phonology.

f While the book is best known for its contribution to phonology, it is also important for its approach to the morphology and syntax of the English verb system. Certainly not an institute textbook, but an important secondary reference.

*Webster's New International Dictionary*, 2nd Edition, 1934. Introductory essays.

Allen, Robert L. *The Verb System of Present-Day American English.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Company, 1966.

a A text oriented analysis of the English verb system which also makes use of a native speaker's intuition. Distinguishes between time reference and time relationship reference in English. Materials for foreign students and speakers of known standard dialects of English have already been based on the analysis displayed in this book.

Francis, W. Nelson *The Structure of American English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958, and accompanying workbook (by McDavid and Green) 1966.

m Probably too advanced for elementary school teachers.

a Although the workbook may make it useful, it is too difficult without the workbook.

Mencken, H. L. *The American Language*, 1 volume abridged edition. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1963. Edition revised by Raven McDavid.

m The two merits are: it shows that language can be fun and the bibliography is up to date.

Waterhouse, Viola "Independent and Dependent Sentences," in *International Journal of American Linguistics*, vol. 29 (1962).

f Of the numerous recent attempts at a grammar of language sectors larger than the sentence, this has been the most effective to present to teachers, in my experience. The fact that written English is the chief source of examples causes this article to have significant implications for the teaching of both language and composition.

# SPEECH IN A LANGUAGE ARTS INSTITUTE: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

by

Kenneth L. Brown
School of Speech
Northwestern University

Educators as well as parents are witnessing one of the most exciting and dynamic periods in American public education today because of developments such as team teaching, individualized reading instruction, emphasis on creativity, structural linguistics, foreign language in the elementary school, and "the New Math." In the mainstream of these trends, the English language arts, always central to the education of the child, hold a strong and important position in the elementary school. Reading and writing have traditionally occupied most teachers' attention, and while emphasis on written expression is still common practice, some signs point toward an attempt to make educators realize fully the centrality of oral communication in the elementary classroom. It is not unusual today to find growing emphasis upon speech and listening in language arts methods textbooks. Ruth Strickland (15:159)*, in discussing communication through spoken language, states that the "main concern of the school is the use of speech and language as means of communication. This is the foundation of everything else in education." Greene and Petty (3:164) suggest that the question is not whether oral language should be emphasized, but rather how much the instructional emphasis should be increased. They recommend that language emphasis in the kindergarten and primary grades should be almost entirely oral. In the third grade one-half to two-thirds of the total time spent on oral and written expression should be devoted to oral language; for the sixth grade they suggest that one-third of the total time in language arts be allotted to oral expression.

The suggestion by individual authors to focus more attention on the oral components of the language arts is only one source that increasingly recognizes the importance of speech and listening. The English Language Arts (10), a publication of our National Council of Teachers of English, is organized around ten crucial issues in the language arts program. First among these is: "What should be the relative emphasis upon the various phases of the language arts and how can they be interrelated?" (10:70) Findings based upon research and studies of relative importance of activities led the commission to conclude that "experiences in speaking in school should ordinarily outnumber those in writing," and "instruction in listening, with particular regard to radio, television, and motion pictures should occupy a larger place in the language arts program than at present" (10:194).

---

* 15 refers to the work numbered 15 in the bibliography appended to this speech; 159 refers to the page number in that work. This method of reference is used throughout this speech.

Another noteworthy commentary on the needs of children is contained in the recommendations of the 1960 White House Conference--a product of the thinking of seven thousand persons in all professions. Fifteen recommendations stated directly or implied a need for training children in speech and listening (11).

More recently, four national professional associations joined in favoring increased emphasis on speech and listening in the publication Children and Oral Language. The essential point of view is expressed as follows:

> Although individuals and groups have long shared concern about effective written communication, those responsible for the bulletin now voice the need for equal concern for the effectiveness with which people listen and speak.
>
> * * *
>
> Articulate communication is essential not only for adequate participation in society but also for self-fulfillment. A balanced program with clearly defined goals and explicitly stated means for achieving these goals must be developed (8:1-2).

## Needed Emphasis on Speech

While the future looks brighter, it is disconcerting that we need to justify emphasis on oral communication in the elementary school. Even today too many teachers think of speech and listening as two more subjects to be covered in an already overcrowded curriculum. We continue to spend too much time teaching pupils to be quiet in too many schools. When speech and listening are taught, they are frequently given only an incidental treatment.

One of the reasons that we need to stress more emphasis on oral expression is that the elementary teacher, whose task is gigantic, does not have a clear conceptual or philosophical understanding of speech education for the child, nor has she been given sufficient direction or help to gain this understanding. Pupil language arts textbooks, which influence classroom content and practice, continue to stress most the writing, grammar, word usage and sentence structure aspects of the language arts. A recent analysis (1) of the speech and listening content of fifty-four pupil language arts textbooks for grades three through six reveals that speech is treated apart from other areas of the language arts in no more than ten percent of the 7,744 lessons studied. Moreover, the treatment accorded oral expression was relatively cursory and did not conform to the best pedagogical procedures we know today. Listening was emphasized apart from other components of the language arts in .63 percent of the lessons where these principles were stressed more frequently: (a) Look at the person who is speaking. (b) Be polite. (c) Sit quietly. (d) Clear the tops of your desk. (e) Think about what the person is saying.

Professional journals that contain scholarly articles are of help when and if they relate the findings of research to classroom theory and practice, but even here the emphasis is more likely to be on reading, writing, language, or children's literature than on speech or listening. Professional journals in the field of speech have shown more concern for the needs of the secondary and college teacher than for the elementary teacher of the self-contained classroom.

Pre-service teacher training requirements do not show evidence of emphasis on study in speech and listening so far as minimum state certification requirements are concerned. Only ten states require study in speech to meet part of the language arts requirement, and this is usually one basic course (17). Summer institutes for teachers of English and language arts are also more frequently aimed toward the secondary school. Is it any wonder that the elementary teacher needs guidance and materials in the theory and practice of teaching speech and listening?

One of the greatest needs for research in the English language arts is an investigation into the status of speech education in the elementary school. We have studies that show the relative amount of time in school that is spent on various forms of communication and that reveal speaking and listening are practiced most. What we need, however, is to determine to what degree the educative process prepares the child for effective participation in oral communication. This needs to be done by studying intensively the speech and listening content of pupil textbooks, language arts methods texts, professional educational journals, and curriculum guides; the speech requirements in teacher training institutions; the levels of speech and listening skills that are attained by pupils at various stages of development; and observed classroom practice. Findings from this kind of research would be valuable for establishing future training programs.

## Recommendations for the Speech Component

Institutes for providing in-service training in the teaching of speech are necessary if we are ever to achieve balanced emphasis of instruction in the language arts. Moreover, these institutes must tailor their programs to the needs of the elementary classroom teacher. Speech education in the elementary school is not a series of watered down high school speech courses; it is designed to meet the needs of children in a curriculum that is designed especially for them.

What kind of program would be most useful in helping the elementary school teacher to provide guidance in speech and listening in the self-contained classroom? What should the speech component of a language art institute contain? Five recommendations are made and implications drawn from each in response to these questions. The recommendations are not mutually exclusive; they are not listed in order of priority; and there is no relationship between the number of recommendations and number of courses needed.

RECOMMENDATION 1. An institute in language arts should equip the classroom teacher with a philosophy of speech education in the elementary school. This implies first that the teacher needs a a broad view of speech as a field of study--as a fine art, a rhetorical art, and a scientific phenomenon. Speech is the oral interpretation of literature, theatre arts, semantics, public speaking, debate, discussion and small group processes, speech and hearing disorders, voice science, phonetics, radio, television, and film. Speech is a process of communication approached by each of these special areas with different frames of reference. The elementary teacher needs to understand the basic nature and goals of these particular specialities if she is ever to appreciate fully the total role of speech in education.

A statement prepared by the Speech Association of America's Committee on the Nature of the Field of Speech (14) points out four assumptions that teachers and scholars of speech share: (1) Speech is man's most distinctive behavior that is learned. It is the most important single feature of the environment within which every individual conducts his life. (2) An educated person needs more than an understanding of speech behavior. He should be capable of transmitting his meanings with accuracy, correctness, and clarity. Thus, knowledge of speech and skill in speaking are inseparably linked. (3) Man cannot avoid being essentially and significantly a communicator. Study of speech and practice in speaking focus on forms that function in the conduct of private and social life, of business, and of government. (4) The acts and arts of communication in speech and language are humanistic. Speech is the center of humane study.

A second implication of the recommendation is that the teacher must realize the role of speech in the academic and social life of the elementary school child. Training in speech and listening is crucial if the child is ever to learn to think freely and critically, to communicate responsibly, and to creatively express his emotions. In a statement of the Illinois Speech Association, Speech Education in the Elementary School, a group of specialists in elementary school speech pedagogy unanimously agree that speech and listening exists to provide the means for critical thinking, to serve as media for interpersonal communication, and to provide for the expression of emotions (6:1).

Out of this realization must evolve the teacher's sense of responsibility to assume guidance in three tasks: First, she must continue the oral language education that is begun at home. Since parents are the first teachers of language, initial skills in speaking and listening are taught by them. Most mothers and fathers, however, do not teach language deliberately. They seldom understand the nature, role, or significance of their child's initial language education. Consequently, pupils who enter the kindergarten vary in speaking and listening skills. A serious deficiency of the child just beginning his formal schooling is often a deficiency in communicative skills.

Second, the teacher must provide remediation in language growth when necessary. Many children enter the elementary school unable to compete intellectually, not because they don't have the potential, but because they have been interacting with a barren environment. Teachers must seek to remediate this pre-school damage done to the language skills of the child. Oral language activity must be increased by large amounts for the early school slow learner, the culturally deprived, and the weak thinker.

The teacher's third responsibility is to recognize and provide for wide individual differences in thinking behaviors. She must not permit chronological age to dominate her content or manner of teaching. She must provide an atmosphere in which each child realizes that he is capable of learning more and that he is capable of "learning how to learn."

The third implication of this recommendation is that the teacher should come to view speech as a means of learning. Speech as an end is an outmoded view. Teachers use speech and listening activities because through them the child gains richer concepts, deeper understandings, and new interpretations that pertain to all areas of the curriculum. In discussing the primacy of basic speech skills, Dr. Clarence T. Simon, a prominent speech psychologist and scholar in the field of speech, states:

> The pupil learns because of his total behavior in the learning situation. Whether we adopt dualistic phrasing and say that the pupil learns through both impression and expression, or say simply that the pupil responds as a whole in his educational environment, we observe the same process; we see that education depends on unhampered, multidirectional intercommunication between all individuals in the classroom (12:39).

RECOMMENDATION 2. An institute in language arts should provide the teacher with theory of speech and skills needed for self-improvement in the acts of speaking and listening.

It is a truism that all elementary school teachers are speech teachers. It follows that they need to develop a body of basic understandings in speech and to improve their own skills in speaking and listening. Language arts institutes need to help the teacher to be a speech model and a motivating force for student improvement. The degree of emphasis on self-improvement will depend upon the backgrounds and skills of institute members; however, it is generally assumed that most elementary teachers have had no more than one functional speech course somewhere in their academic or professional training.

Demonstrated skill in the fundamentals of speech is a prerequisite of the highest order for effective oral communication and good teaching. To this end, the teacher should have experiences designed to bolster her poise and confidence in speaking; to improve her vocal flexibility, rate, projection and quality; to raise her standards of articulation and pronunciation; to improve her use of visual stimuli to clarify the spoken message; to improve her ability to organize ideas and materials clearly and concisely in order to evoke particular responses; to stimulate critical evaluation of ideas when listening to others; and to improve her choice, use, and arrangement of words so as to carry the thought intelligibly, convincingly, and accurately.

Theory of the speech fundamentals ought to complement practice in speaking. Much of this will be on a basic level and will include study of the vocal and hearing mechanisms; formation of vowel, consonant, and diphthong sounds, how they are recorded, and how phonemes and morphemes interact; logical and psychological arrangement of ideas and materials for informing and persuading listeners; the nature and purposes of listening; the speaker-audience relationship; the differences between oral and written style in language; semantic changes in language; the relationship between language and thought; the nature and principles of using the visible speech code; and problems in adjustment to the speech situation.

In addition to theory and practice in speech fundamentals, the teacher should have understandings and skills in the basic speech forms. In public speaking she should come to know and practice the preparation and presentation of speeches for different purposes. She should pool information and solve problems in small group discussion. In oral interpretation she should analyze and interpret prose, poetry, and dramatic literature. She should have experiences in drama as a creative art with emphasis upon study of plot, character, dialogue, movement and grouping, the roles of observation, sensitivity, imagination, and use of voice and body in acting.

The teacher must know and do before she teaches others. To these ends the second recommendation is made.

RECOMMENDATION 3. An institute in language arts should help the teacher to understand patterns of child growth, particularly in language and speech development, and to draw implications from them for establishing a speech curriculum in the elementary school.

While a teacher is concerned with the particular children in her classroom, she is better equipped to help them when she knows how they developed prior to entry in her class, and what is likely to happen to them when they leave. She needs to know the total pattern of growth of all children as well as the characteristics of her own students. She should be familiar with the development of motor abilities, body structure, emotional maturity, and social awareness in children. Interest and play activities are important. Of utmost significance is the development of learning and understanding in children--their awareness, alertness, remembering, reasoning, and concept formation.

Particular emphasis should be devoted to language and speech development. Tracing the child's progression from the birth cry through true speech from infancy through junior high school should be a part of the teacher's study. This knowledge should be gained by reading significant research studies by Strickland (16), McCarthy (9), Loban (7), Davis (2), Smith (13), Hahn (4), Higginbotham (5), and others.

Conclusions from such study will be meaningful when the teacher uses them to draw implications for establishing a speech and listening program within the language arts framework of the elementary school. In this way, speech education in the elementary school develops from the needs of the child.

RECOMMENDATION 4. An institute in language arts should help the teacher to understand the relationships of speech and listening to other components of the language arts, and to the entire elementary curriculum.

The elementary teacher is not just a teacher of speech and listening. She teaches handwriting, spelling, written composition, word usage, grammar, sentence study, reading, literature, and research and study methods. All of these skills are grouped under the label "Language Arts." We say that growth in one area affects growth and development in another. Since this is the case, it behooves the teacher to understand the interrelationships among listening, speaking, reading, and writing to support integrated teaching. We are told that writing depends on oral language, but to what degree and exactly how is this so? What, if anything, can the teacher do in oral language instruction to help the child with spelling difficulties? What reading readiness activities assure growth in speech or listening as well? What is the relationship between speaking and reading difficulties? What effect does speech improvement have upon improvement in reading? How does facility in the use of language in speaking affect language usage in writing? What common factors are involved in listening and reading? Of special importance is the relationship between speech and thinking. These are the kinds of questions we need to help teachers answer by studying pertinent research.

Speech and listening are not confined to the language arts period. As tools for learning, they are found in social studies, mathematics, science, art, music, and virtually all areas of the curriculum. Oral communication is a central part of classroom planning and living. A committee of children prepares a panel discussion on the events that lead to the Revolutionary War. A nature club is formed according to parliamentary rules. An oral report or demonstration of an experiment in science is underway. Children dramatize a scene from Laura

Wilder's Little House on the Prairie. All of these speech events are primary means of exchanging ideas, extending concepts, gaining new interpretations, and deepening understandings. This is speech education in action--serving the child in all his learning. This is how speech and listening are central to all that occurs in the modern school. The teacher needs to become aware of the pervasiveness of speech in the curriculum and of how speech education provides for learning in depth.

RECOMMENDATION 5. An institute in language arts should equip the teacher with the theory, the materials, and the methods needed in good speech pedagogy.

A modern self-contained classroom is frequently a language laboratory throughout the school day. When speech is taught by the classroom teacher certain benefits can result: (1) Speech can be taught as the need arises and therefore when the motivation to communicate is highest. (2) The elementary teacher can evaluate development in speech and listening in relation to the child's total growth. No one is in a better position to see this pattern than the classroom teacher. (3) No single teacher has the opportunity to provide training in speaking and listening for all children as does the elementary teacher. In high school, speech is often an elective subject or an extra-curricular activity if it is included in the curriculum at all. The time to reach all children is in the elementary grades. (4) The elementary teacher can reinforce newly acquired speech skills of her students by seeing that students apply and use them in all areas of the curriculum. Thus, the child benefits and the curriculum is enriched.

For these benefits to occur, the teacher must give careful thought and preparation to the teaching of speech. Incidental or indirect teaching does only part of the job, but this is the primary way speech is taught in the elementary grades. Oral expression activities become service devices for the curriculum. Speech becomes just another method of teaching anything and everything. This may implement well the development of understandings and skills in the social studies, or science, or mathematics, but it does not assure equal growth in speech and listening skills. In short, speech activities may serve other areas of the curriculum, but they must do more; they must serve the child's growth in oral communication and in self-expression. This should not be left as a possible by-product of incidental teaching.

Direct or planned instruction is as essential in teaching speech and listening as it is in other subjects. Pupils do not develop the speech and listening skills they need merely by expressing themselves any more than they learn to read by staring at a book. It has been assumed too long that frequent participation in speech activities assures development in the right direction.

Direct instruction does not imply that speech should be taught separately. Whenever possible it should be integrated with other areas of the curriculum. For example, if group discussion occurs during a unit on "Life in Mexico," the development of discussion skills and understandings can and should be stressed as well as concepts pertaining to Mexico. Hence the child grows in his understanding of Mexican village life, but he also grows in discussion skills such as understanding the question, making remarks that carry group thinking forward, assuming leadership when necessary, supporting opinions with explanation and proof, and evaluating the relevancy of facts.

The primary goal of the work in speech pedagogy, then, should be to help the teacher to teach speech directly as well as indirectly and also to integrate speech training throughout the curriculum. To attain this goal, the pedagogical aspect of the institute should stress the broad goals of speech education; means of evaluating the goals; methods for motivating progress; techniques for guiding growth in the various speech forms; and development of useful materials that can be used in classroom teaching.

The broad goals of speech education in the elementary school that need to be stressed have been identified by the Illinois Speech Association's Committee on Speech in the Elementary School as follows:

> (a) to preserve the spontaneity and enthusiasm in speaking and listening which most children possess when they enter first grade; (b) to help the child sense a need for good oral communication skills; (c) to improve ability to speak audibly, fluently, expressively, in a pleasant voice, with clear, but not overly precise, articulation, and with appropriate bodily movement; (d) to improve ability to organize ideas and materials simply, clearly, and concisely; (e) to foster sound thinking and logical reasoning as a speaker and listener; (f) to foster enjoyment when leading or participating in all forms of speaking and listening: discussing, conversing, interviewing, oral reporting, announcing, explaining, describing, reading aloud, telling stories, and dramatizing; (g) to set up, develop, and apply basic attitudes, standards, and skills, which make speaking and listening efficient, satisfying, and profitable for the individual

> and for groups; (h) to encourage the child to evaluate his speaking and listening skills as well as the skills of others in an effort to strive for continuous improvement (6:8-9).

When the teacher understands these goals and all that they imply, she must be shown how to evaluate and diagnose each child's strengths and weaknesses in speaking and listening. She must learn how to do this both systematically and efficiently in a variety of speech situations such as conversation, discussion, reporting, oral reading, and storytelling. From this kind of evaluation a suitable level for beginning direct instruction can be determined.

The next tasks are to give the children something to work for, and to motivate them. These involve knowing how to set up immediate goals and standards for improvement. Some teachers stress items such as "speak loudly," "stand straight," and "speak clearly," but these verbal orders are not as effective as is cherishing spontaneous expression, original thinking, and sound reasoning. The teacher will certainly help children to improve their voices, enunciation, and posture when necessary, but she will be more concerned with the child's desire to communicate ideas. She will not stifle a sincere or enthusiastic contribution with ill-timed rules. She will open the door to communication by sharing her own experiences, drawing ideas from others, allowing children to exchange ideas freely, and listening to them--really listening!

The primary grade teacher will specifically want to know how to make the share and tell period more effective. She will want specific techniques for improving articulation and simple voice problems in class, perhaps during the "speech improvement time." Storytelling techniques will need to be improved since the child spends much time in this activity. A most important part of the teacher's study should be devoted to techniques for guiding children in creative drama. Informal activities such as solving immediate problems, conversation, simple social amenities, and planning projects and activities demand some consideration.

The same experiences will continue in the intermediate grades but here the teacher will need to emphasize some of the more formal speech forms: discussion, oral reports, oral reading and choric speaking, conducting meetings according to parliamentary procedure, and debating. Creative drama, as in the primary grades, will continue to be stressed.

The junior high school years will find the child participating more frequently in informative and persuasive speaking, debating, informal and audience discussion, oral interpretation, and drama.

Listening, the language medium we use most frequently, should be stressed for all teachers, kindergarten through grade eight. They need to know the nature, levels, and purposes of listening, and habits we have developed. Specific techniques for teaching listening at all grade levels will be valuable. These purposes for listening need to be stressed: to recognize speech sounds; to get information; to make critical judgements; to appreciate; to enjoy. Whenever speech is taught, parallel listening skills should be stressed.

Studies of children's interests tell us that the child spends much time in televiewing. The teacher will need to know how she can channel this interest to benefit the child. She will need to help him to evaluate his viewing preferences and to set standards for judging programs. She will want to know how to deepen his appreciation of certain programs and how to use radio and television as a primary source of information, but she will also allow the child to enjoy radio and television programs and motion pictures. The good teacher will not build a sense of guilt in the child when he does not enjoy something which he "ought" to enjoy.

Primary responsibility for administering therapy to the speech handicapped child rests with the speech correctionist, but the teacher can offer help in the classroom. This help is supportive therapy. Training is needed to help the teacher to recognize and to know what she can do for the stutterer, the child with a hearing loss, a hoarse voice, a cleft palate, an articulation defect, or a psychoneurological disorder. These are problems that must be faced in approximately ten per cent of elementary school pupils. The teacher cannot afford to ignore them.

The pedagogical problems in teaching speech become even more complex when one considers that there are specific skills, understandings, and attitudes that must be mastered in each of the forms suggested above. Materials must be developed and progress must be evaluated.

Since speech education is for all children, the special speech needs of the slow learner, the culturally deprived, and the gifted child must be analyzed and met. There is a great need to study how the oral language and communication development of these students contributes to and affects development in other instructional areas.

When all this is accomplished, the teacher must have guidance in fitting the puzzle together. She must have practice in integrating the speech and listening program in the social studies, science, music, art, mathematics, and the integrated unit of study.

## Implementing the Recommendations

The task proposed is a large one. How might it be accomplished?

Areas of study that are common to all the language arts need to be identified and studied together. The speech component of the institute holds no exclusive claim on the study of language and speech development or of the interrelationships among the language arts. Study in these areas would be useful to all components of the institute.

Some different areas of study might be integrated. Children's literature seems to be a natural area for the study of oral interpretation of prose and poetry, choric interpretation, storytelling, and possibly even creative drama, and puppetry. Perhaps there is common ground in the study of phonemes and morphemes of our language that can be applied in speech improvement, spelling, reading, and language. Elements in oral and written composition could be integrated insofar as they are truly common to both spoken and written language. Since the development of creativity is a common goal, it might be possible to study creativity in writing, in dramatizing, and in other speech forms.

The idea of teacher self-improvement in speaking and listening was introduced. This could be extended to include reading and writing as well. One language arts laboratory might be developed to improve and strengthen the teacher's skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

While integration of the language arts is useful and educationally sound in some respects, we also recognize that each area of language study presents unique problems that merit special and separate treatment. This is the case in the philosophy and pedagogy of speech education. An educational philosophy begins to evolve with knowledge of and guided learning in speech and listening, but it is crystallized in the study of speech pedagogy. This requires a course in study of the elementary school speech program with emphasis upon methods and materials of teaching. Such a course should contain units of study in these areas: Developing a Philosophy of Speech Education; Listening; Voice and Articulation Improvement For All Children; Conversation and Discussion; Giving Talks; Storytelling; Oral Reading and Choric Speaking; Radio-TV-Motion Pictures; and Assemblies and Class Programs. Special study should also be devoted to the drama program in the elementary grades with emphasis upon creative drama and puppetry, and their relationship to children's theatre. This emphasis on drama could be a part of the speech pedagogy course or a separate course depending upon the time available.

It is not the intent of this paper to map out the entire institute program, but in order to draw together the suggestions of this paper, a format might include:

(1) The Language Arts as a Field of Study--a course devoted to a study of the nature of the language arts--oral communication, reading, writing, language and literature; emphasis upon each component as a field of study but having a common base; child and language development; interrelationships; research; current trends and developments.

(2) Language Laboratory for Self-Improvement--a course devoted to the teachers' understanding of and improvement in the fundamentals of speech, writing, listening, and reading; application of skills in a variety of forms. This course might be taught by a team of specialists in each component of instruction.

(3) The Program in Speech, Drama, and Listening--a course devoted to methods, development of materials, and problems in teaching speech and listening in grades one through eight.

(4) The Program in Reading, Writing, and Composition--a course devoted to methods, development of materials, and study of problems in teaching these areas in grades one through eight.

(5) The Program in Language and Literature--a course devoted to the study of latest trends and problems in teaching language and literature to elementary school children.

Should the content of each course be too heavy for one summer's study, would it not seem wise to recommend two-year summer institutes?

Staffing the speech component of an institute can be a problem. The teacher needs to have a general background in the field of speech with special training in creative drama and speech education in the elementary school; an educational philosophy; knowledge and experience in curriculum planning for the elementary school; experience in teaching school age children; evidence of graduate study in the field of speech and drama; and study in the teaching of related areas such as reading, writing, and children's literature. To find these qualifications in the immediate future one will probably have to rely upon team teaching. To create programs for training future teachers who will possess these qualifications is a challenge for colleges and universities throughout the country.

We are living in a time when human knowledge increases daily. The amount of information that appears each day is so large that we soon will need to revise our thinking about the curriculum and training of teachers for the self-contained classroom. College and university departments need to conduct research and assume leadership in the preparation of teachers to meet increasingly specialized tasks. Some universities and states now require that students preparing to teach in the elementary school have a major or minor in an academic subject in addition to elementary education. This has lead to the establishment of majors and minors in speech, drama, and creative arts for the elementary school. Such training places in the school teams of quasi-specialized teachers who can help each other in curriculum planning and teaching problems that relate to each area of study.

To meet this need, college speech departments, in cooperation with departments of English and elementary education, must provide a core of specialized speech courses for the elementary classroom teacher to include: (1) methods of teaching speech in the elementary school; (2) the study of children's literature through speech experience; (3) study of classroom teacher's role in helping the speech handicapped child; and (4) special study in creative drama.

The university also has the responsibility for encouraging research and making the results available to the classroom teacher. We need to discover current practices in elementary school speech education. We need more language and speech development studies, particularly on the intermediate grade level. We need to discover the speech characteristics and needs of the culturally deprived. We need to test assumptions regarding the value of various speech activities. Regardless of the type of study one may prefer--experimental, empirical, historical, descriptive--many problems await the systematic study of the scholar.

Until we have more college teachers who are specially equipped to teach speech education in the elementary school we need to use the ones who are available in team teaching situations. We can and should rely on professional associations in helping to locate qualified personnel. The Speech Association of America consists of many interest groups one of which is devoted to the study of speech in the elementary school. The American Educational

Theatre Association has, as one of its three internal divisions the Children's Theatre Conference. Regional organizations--the Central States Speech Association, the Western Speech Association, the Southern Speech Association, and the Speech Association of the Eastern States--have committees on speech in the elementary and secondary schools. State associations are sometimes active in establishing leadership in this field. For example, the Illinois Speech Association has a standing committee that concentrates on the study of speech in the elementary school.

While the task is large it can be accomplished by careful study of the similarities and differences among the various components of language arts, a recognition that _all_ aspects must be emphasized to realize balanced instruction, and cooperative planning by specialists in each component to avoid gaps and overlapping of instruction.

## Bibliography

1. Brown, Kenneth L. "An Analysis of the Speech and Listening Content of Selected Pupil Textbooks in Language Arts for the Elementary Schools: Grades Three through Six." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Graduate School, 1965.

2. Davis, Edith A. *The Development of Linguistic Skills in Twins, Singletons with Siblings, and Only Children from Age Five to Ten Years.* University of Minnesota, Institute of Child Welfare Monograph Series, No. 14, 1937.

3. Green, Harry A., and Petty, Walter T. *Developing Language Skills in the Elementary Schools,* 2d. ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1959.

4. Hahn, Elise. "An Analysis of the Content, Form, and Delivery of the Speech of First Grade Children in Audience Situations." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Norwestern University, The Graduate School, 1947.

5. Higginbotham, Dorothy. "A Study of the Speech of Kindergarten, First, and Second Grade Children in Audience Situations with Particular Attention to Maturation and Learning as Evidenced in Content, Form, and Delivery." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, The Graduate School, 1961.

6. Illinois Speech Association. "Speech Education in the Elementary School." Prepared for the Association by the Committee on Speech in the Elementary School, Kenneth L. Brown, Chairman, 1965. Dittoed.

7. Loban, Walter D. *The Language of Elementary School Children.* Research Report No. 1. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

8. Mackintosh, Helen K. (ed.) *Children and Oral Language.* A Joint Statement of the Association for Childhood Education International, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, International Reading Association, National Council of Teachers of English. Washington, D.C.: ACEI, ASCD, IRA, NCTE, 1964.

9. McCarthy, Dorothea A. *The Language Development of the Pre-School Child.* University of Minnesota, Institute of Child Welfare Monograph Series, No. 4, 1930.

10. National Council of Teachers of English. *The English Language Arts.* Prepared by the Commission on the English Curriculum. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952.

11. *Recommendations.* Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth, No. 137. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

12. Simon, Clarence T. "The Primacy of Basic Speech Skills," *The Role of Speech in the Elementary School,* Speech Association of America, editor. Washington, D. C.: Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association, 1946-47.

13. Smith, Madorah E. *An Investigation of the Development of the Sentence and the Extent of Vocabulary in Young Children.* State University of Iowa, Studies in Child Welfare, Vol. 5, No. 5, 1926.

14. Speech Association of America. "The Field of Speech: Its Purposes and Scope in Education." Prepared for the Association by the Committee on the Nature of the Field of Speech, Karl F. Wallace, Chairman. Undated. Mimeographed.

15. Strickland, Ruth G. *The Language Arts in the Elementary School.* Boston: D. C. Heath, 1957.

16. Strickland. *The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children.* Bulletin of the School of Education, Vol. 38, No. 4. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1962.

17. Woellner, Elizabeth and Wood, Aurilla. *Requirements for Certification.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

# REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SPEECH

## Rationale

The development of institutes seeking to re-educate elementary school teachers in the area of communicative behavior depends upon an agreement by and among the various disciplines--literature, composition, reading, language, and speech--on a common ideational model or system . Such an agreement will tend to reduce the differences and to maximize the commonalities of the communication behaviors desired in elementary school children. When reading, writing, language, composition, linguistics, and speech are taught, the teacher should be able to see them in relation to common educational objectives. The primary objective of the elementary school is the production of communication behaviors which facilitate the child's learning processes in terms of the affective and cognitive domains. This ideational model will serve as a basis for evaluating any re-training proposal.

The predominant communication behaviors of the early elementary school child are speaking and listening. This committee notes that the predominance of learning experiences connected with the total development of communication behaviors is essentially carried on through the speech and listening skills of the child. Therefore, in the design of any institute dealing with elementary education, particularly language arts institutes, primary consideration must be given to the training of teachers in the oral communication process.

Based upon the above rationale, this committee proposes that a common core of knowledge or understandings, skills, and instructional practices be taught in language arts institutes. This core should be a part of every general and special language arts institute. These institutes would serve two purposes: (1) to retrain elementary school teachers in the classroom, and (2) to retrain teachers to serve as speech consultants in educational settings that desire specialists.

The committee has organized its recommendations under the following three categories: (1) understandings or knowledge necessary for teaching oral communication; (2) principles and skills required of the teachers for effective communication in the classroom; (3) instructional tutorials and internships required to produce effective learning of oral communication behaviors for children in the classroom.

# I. UNDERSTANDINGS OR KNOWLEDGE NECESSARY FOR TEACHING ORAL COMMUNICATION

## A. Cultural and Environmental Influences on Communicative Behaviors

### 1. Rationale

Communicative behaviors are in large measure the result of the culture into which the child is born. The language presented to the child, for example, is an experiential condition over which he initially has limited control. The environment into which the child is born will, in part, be a factor which is non-controllable; at the same time, it is the primary factor over which he will seek to effect control. The method of his control will be primarily linguistic; the degree of his control of the environment will depend largely upon the degree of the sophistication of his language facility.

The influences of culture and environment on language, and the uses of language behavior to modify these influences are not commonly understood by the elementary school teacher. Therefore, it is necessary for the elementary teacher to gain an understanding of these influences in order that she can maximize the ability of the child to exercise meaningful control over his culture and environment. Furthermore, this condition requires that the teacher provide the elementary school child with a physical and emotional classroom environment which will permit the child to develop an awareness of his right to exercise power and control in language use and to develop language skills requisite for such environmental control.

### 2. Areas of Study

a. A comparative study of variant cultures with focus on conceptual differences found by a linguistic analysis.

b. A study of the American culture with a focus on the ways in which our culture influences our language, thought, and behavior.

c. A study of sub-cultures and specific environments with a focus on human behaviors as derived from those cultures and environments.

d. A comparative study of the language differences of individuals who are products of linguistically deprived sub-cultures and other individuals who are products of linguistically enriched sub-cultures. The particular focus in this unit is on individuals who have and who have not developed linguistic behaviors necessary for influencing the environment from which they came.

B. Nature of the Communicative Process and the Interrelatedness of the "Communicative Arts"

1. Rationale

Twenty years ago classical rhetorical and grammatical formulations were the primary models which shaped American English language arts curricula at all levels of education. The past twenty years have produced a body of knowledge concerning the nature and functions of the communication act which is supported by much empirical research. This body of knowledge derived, in part, from traditional rhetorical and grammatical theories has produced elements, operations and laws which when examined lead to a revised understanding of the communication process and, subsequently, result in improved models for constructing language arts curricula.

An examination of the present language arts curricula in the elementary school and the curricula for the preparation of the elementary school teacher leads this committee to the conclusion that many elementary school teachers are not provided with a general theory based on communication processes. Language arts teachers should understand the nature and functions of communication if they are to develop the desired communication behaviors in their students. Therefore, language arts institutes should provide teachers with an understanding of this process.

2. Areas of Study

a. Consideration of the elements, operations, and laws of communication process.

b. Conceptualization of communication as inter-and intra-personal behaviors.

c. Consideration of the interrelatedness of symbol systems, affective and cognitive, as they function in both interpersonal and in intra-personal communication acts.

d. The implications of recent theories for examining the meaning and role of the traditionally defined communicative arts--language, reading, writing, speaking, listening, composition and literature--with special emphasis on their differences and similarities.

C. Descriptive Survey of the Development of Language in Children

1. Rationale

The body of information related to the learning of language should be of paramount concern to teachers of all the language arts. Knowledge concerning acquisition of language and the process of oral language development are basic to an understanding of the language-communication behaviors of the child. This process is a continuing one throughout childhood and is inextricably a product of maturation and learning. A thorough treatment of the process of language development should be a vital part of any institute which would better prepare the elementary teacher to adjust classroom experiences to the individual language needs of the child.

2. Areas of Study

A study of the oral language development of the child might include consideration of:

a. The physiological and neurological components of speech.

b. The stages of development in child language.

c. The acquisition of vocabulary.

d. The development of a structural system encompassing phonemics, phonetics, and syntax.

e. The acquisition of a sound system including the vocal, intonational, and rhythmic characteristics of English speech.

f. The functions of language for the child.

g. The factors which may impede or encourage the developmental language process including: physical characteristics, intelligence, sex differences, sibling status, culture, geography, socio-economic group, and the emotional climate in which the language develops.

D. Creativity in Oral Communication

1. Rationale

An awareness of the need for developing creative behavior has become a matter of national concern among parents, educators and groups representing the arts, sciences, government and business. If we are to fulfill the need for creative thinkers in our society it is imperative that we begin to stimulate rather than stifle the potential of children in our elementary schools. However, most elementary teachers have had limited experience in developing the creative behavior of children and even less in developing their own creative potential. Teachers of speech arts have historically been concerned with creative oral behaviors in themselves and in their students and therefore are qualified uniquely to provide training in creativity for elementary teachers.

In order for elementary classroom teachers to stimulate creative behavior among their students they must value their own uniqueness and the uniqueness of each child. A classroom climate conducive to creativity must prevail. The teacher must structure learning situations that facilitate creative oral behavior. Typically a teacher uses inductive methods to lead students to discover the rules that govern their creativity by using inductive methods.

A child learns about his world through his senses. These impressions are stored within him and are the raw material from which he creates. The child must be given ample opportunity for spontaneous, free, independent expression which is reinforced by the teacher before the rules that govern his creativity are considered. Movement, self-talk, and dramatic play of the child provide an evaluation-free creative experience that forms the necessary foundation for higher level creativity which results from greater control, techniques, and skills. For young children language and movement accompany each other. By acting out words, thoughts, and feelings he draws on his reservoir of stored experience and develops meaningful associations.

2. Areas of Study

   a. Concepts and definitions of creativity.

   b. Creativity: process and product.

   c. Relation of creativity to intelligence.

   d. Factors that facilitate and inhibit creativity.

   e. Effect of creative experience on mental health and self-image.

   f. Verbal and non-verbal components with special reference to drama and other forms of literature.

E. Communicative Disorders and the Classroom Teacher

1. Rational

The Institute must be concerned with the classroom teacher's role in the treatment of communicative disorders. A study of the speech correction of children's speech handicaps must include a clear understanding of the specific and differing functions of the certified speech therapist in relation to that of the classroom teacher. The classroom teacher needs specific instruction in the formulation of the sounds of English speech and their sequential development. Such instruction should enable the teacher to apply this knowledge in the correction of problems of articulation and voice either for the individual child or for small groups of children with similar difficulties.

Related to this responsibility is the importance of the classroom teacher's role in the general speech improvement of children whose oral language does not call undue attention to itself in its variation from normal speech behavior but which nevertheless needs specific attention in the areas of voice and diction.

Equally important for the teacher is an awareness of those serious physiological and psychological communication disorders which must be left to the specialist. In these instances the classroom teacher must see her participation in recognition, in referral and in supportive theory.

2. Areas of Study

   a. Differentiation between normal and abnormal speech problems.

   b. Identification of problems that fall within the range of normal speech, such as simple sound omissions, substitutions, and distortions; careless pronunciation; unpleasant vocal quality; inappropriate pitch, volume, rate and rhythm; and substandard regional speech.

   c. Identification of the following kinds of speech handicaps for referral to the speech therapist: delayed speech; cleft palate; non-fluencies and stuttering; psychoneurological disorders; severe voice problems; and foreign dialect.

   d. Arrangement of classroom conditions and environment to facilitate the speech handicapped child's learning and adjustment.

## II. PRINCIPLES AND SKILLS REQUIRED FOR THE TEACHING OF EFFECTIVE ORAL COMMUNICATION IN THE CLASSROOM

An institute in language arts (1) should provide the teacher with the skills and practices needed for her own improvement in the arts and acts of oral communication, and (2) should provide her with the principles which will enable her to guide her students into more skillful use of the functional, artistic and ethical forms of oral communication.

### Understandings and Competencies for the Teacher

Instruction is needed if the teacher is to be a speech model and a motivating force for student improvement. Demonstrated skill in the fundamentals of oral communication is pre-requisite to good teaching of communication skills for the teacher must know and do before she teaches others. To this end, the teacher should have experiences which will contribute to her knowledge and understanding of oral communication as an inter-personal act; refine her ability to formulate, arrange and communicate ideas and materials in ways which will elicit desired responses from the receiver; maximize her ability to examine critically messages received aurally and visually; increase her skill in the use of visual signs to amplify the spoken message; improve her vocal flexibility, rate, projection and quality; raise her standards of diction and pronunciation; extend her ability to select, arrange and use language which conveys the message intelligibly, accurately and productively; and, augment her feelings of poise and confidence as a communicator. Foremost, such instruction should involve the development of skill in the informal, direct, one-to-one type of communication which makes up a major portion of the teacher's communicating time. Instruction is also needed to develop competence in such specific communication acts as group discussion, public speaking, and oral interpretation of literature including story-telling and the reading of prose, poetry and dramatic literature. Instruction for the teacher should also include literary experiences in drama as a creative art with emphasis upon the importance of observation, sense awareness and imagination; upon constructive criticism; upon actor-actor and audience-player relationships; and upon the use of voice and body in conveying meaning. A basic awareness of the nature and functions of communication should pervade the teacher's development of skill in all types of communication acts.

### Understandings and Competencies for the Child

The second function of the language arts institute is to help the teacher understand patterns of child growth as they relate to language and speech development and to draw implications from these understandings for establishing a curriculum in the elementary school which emphasizes greater skill in oral communication, the most used and the basic language art.

Developmental Skills. The oral language behaviors which children demonstrate are, of course, related to maturation as well as to learning. Thus, the primary grade teacher needs to know, specifically, what activities such as "sharing time" can contribute to the child's overall language development and how best to conduct the activity so as to achieve the maximum benefit for the participant. Storytelling and oral reading are forms of communication which also deserve attention at this level. Another important part of the teacher's study should be devoted to techniques for guiding children in creative drama. Informal activities such as solving immediate classroom problems, conversation, learning and using simple social amenities, and planning projects and activities all provide opportunities for improving the young child's ability to communicate successfully with others.

In the intermediate and upper grades communication skills may be greatly refined as the teacher begins to emphasize directly those behaviors which will enable the child to control his environment more effectively. As the subject matter of the curriculum becomes more complex so must the child grow in his ability to communicate. This need for greater skill requires that the teacher provide experiences and direct instruction designed to increase the child's knowledge of the total communication process and to improve his ability to communicate in a variety of situations from informal communication to the more formal types including discussions, oral reporting, reading aloud, conducting meetings, and creative drama.

Thus, speech education in the elementary school develops from the needs of the child, and should embrace a speaking and listening program within the language arts framework. It is necessary that the teacher give careful thought and preparation to the techniques she will employ in improving the child's ability to communicate orally. Planned instruction is as essential to developing skills in sending and receiving oral messages as it is to subject matter areas of the curriculum whether the skills are approached directly or indirectly. Pupils do not develop the speaking and listening abilities they need merely by expressing themselves or as a result of the teacher's frequent admonition to "listen." Elementary teachers have assumed too long that by providing oral activities in the classroom they are necessarily improving the child's ability to communicate. The institute, then, must include instruction in the principles that govern those speech acts which should be inherent in the child's classroom experience if he is to grow as a communicator.

Integrated Activities. The classroom teacher needs to realize, however, that speaking and listening are not confined to the language arts period. As the dynamic vehicle of learning, they become a part of social studies, mathematics, science, art, music, and virtually every area of the curriculum. Oral communication is the single element most frequently present in all classroom experiences. Direct instruction, the approach to oral language most frequently employed on the middle and upper elementary levels, does not mean that speaking and listening should be taught in a specially scheduled class. Whenever possible, they should be integrated with other areas of the curriculum. At the same time a child is learning about the products of Brazil he may be learning skills in oral reporting or something about pooling ideas with his peers in discussion. Hence, the child grows in his understanding of the economic life of a South American country while he also develops some competence in finding material, selecting and arranging ideas with consideration for the receiver, making remarks that carry thinking forward, supporting opinions with explanation and proof, asking questions, and evaluating his own ideas and the ideas of others.

Listening, the language medium used most frequently, should be taught at all levels in the elementary school and integrated into every area of the curriculum. Teachers need to know the nature, levels, and purposes of listening, and to be aware of poor listening habits which children may develop. Specific techniques for teaching listening at all grade levels are an important consideration for the teacher. At various times listening instruction may stress recognition of speech sounds, listening for information, critical listening, and listening for appreciation and enjoyment. Whenever speech is taught, parallel listening skills should be stressed.

Throughout her study of the many arts and skills involved in effective communication the teacher must be ever mindful of the functions of communication in the child's life. Rarely is she justified in segregating communication skills from the child's other activities for this approach is contrary to the way in which the child experiences communication in his everyday life. Always communication must be functional for the child whether that function be purely utilitarian or whether it be to satisfy some less tangible motive. Communication instruction in the classroom is most meaningful when it is integrated with all areas of the curriculum and when it is made an integral part of the child's total educational experiences.

Learning and Evaluation. Implied throughout all of these suggestions for improving oral communication skill is the need for the teacher to know something of the learning process. Such understanding is necessary if she is to translate her information and theories into productive learning opportunities for the child. The successful teacher of oral communication must constantly apply her knowledge of learning theory in selecting experiences which will result in the child's acquisition of desirable communication behaviors.

Evaluation is an important part of all learning. The teacher who would improve her student's ability to communicate orally should establish behavioral objectives for speaking and listening which will influence the selecting and developing of instructional experiences. These same objectives may then serve as the standard by which teacher and students may evaluate progress in learning. Although all aspects of the speech arts may not be immediately subject to measurement, it is important that the teacher make a concerted effort to identify the many behaviors which are desirable outcomes of communication experiences in the classroom. No aspect of speech teaching is more neglected or is likely to yield greater positive results than the thoughtful use of behavioral objectives.

Because speech education is for all children, the unique communication needs of the slow learner, the culturally deprived, and the gifted child should also be analyzed and met. There is a great need to know more about how and to what extent the child's ability to communicate influences his adjustment to his environment and how it affects his development in the other instructional areas.

Skill in oral uses of the language is generally considered a major objective of elementary education and should, therefore, be an important consideration in the planning of language arts institutes for elementary teachers. Both the speaking and listening behaviors of the teacher and the communication skills of the child need to receive attention in such institutes. Not only does the teacher need to improve herself as a speech model and motivator, but she also needs to know more about oral language development and the process of learning so that she may plan and implement oral experiences which will result in maximum oral communication skill in the child.

## III. INSTRUCTIONAL TUTORIALS AND INTERNSHIPS

Instructional tutorials and internships for the teacher will be necessary so that she will be equipped to plan for and guide the child's learning of effective oral communication behaviors. Institute participants will be involved in the following aspects of the instructional process: (1) setting behavioral objectives for oral communication; (2) developing criteria and instruments for evaluating pupil attainment of the goals; (3) devising ways and means for motivating pupil growth; (4) selecting and creating printed and multi-sensory materials; (5) developing techniques for guiding growth in the arts and acts of speech.

Involvement in these acts will require a materials center equipped with duplicating and audio-visual machines, tape recorders with earphones, film projectors, overhead and opaque projectors, phonographs, and materials to include books, films and filmstrips, records and tapes, transparencies and overlays, models, etc. The purpose of the center is to acquaint the participant with the commercial materials that are available and to provide her with the maximum number of resources for creating her own materials.

The institute should be staffed with full-term instructors and short-term consultants in creative drama, educational psychology, listening, group dynamics, speech correction and improvement, curriculum planning, linguistics, and communication theory. Guest lecturers and teams of "authorities" might be recruited from the ranks of sociology, anthropology, philosophy, and the fine and performing arts. Depending upon the nature of the institute, consultants in reading, composition, and children's literature will of course be utilized. In addition, there should be a full-time librarian and director of the materials center and sufficient clerical and secretarial help.

The institute should be programmed to allow for frequent and scheduled consultations between participants and instructors or guest lecturers.

There needs to be provision for teaching demonstrations by consultants and experimentation by conference participants. To these ends, children and suitable space must be provided. These sessions should be followed by thorough and constructive self, peer and consultant evaluation.

# SPEECH BIBLIOGRAPHY

## GENERAL WORKS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION, PUBLIC SPEAKING, DISCUSSION, AND GROUP PROCESS

Auer, J. Jeffrey. *An Introduction to Research in Speech.* N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1959.

Auer, J. Jeffrey. *Essentials of Parliamentary Procedure.* Third Edition. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Barnlund, Dean C. and Franklyn S. Haiman. *The Dynamics of Discussion.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960.

Berlo, David K. *The Process of Communication.* N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

Bettinghaus, Erwin P. *Message Preparation: The Nature of Proof.* Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Black, John W. and Wilbur E. Moore. *Speech Code, Meaning and Communication.* N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Blankenship, Jane. *Public Speaking: A Rhetorical Perspective.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bormann, Ernest G. *Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts.* N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Bosmajian, Haig A. *Readings in Speech.* Evanston: Harper and Row, 1965.

Brigance, William N. *Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society.* Second Edition. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Brockett, Oscar G., Samuel L. Becker, and Donald C. Bryant. *A Bibliographical Guide to Research in Speech and Dramatic Art.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1963.

Bryant, Donald C. and Karl R. Wallace. *Fundamentals of Public Speaking.* Third Edition. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.

Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. *Audience Analysis.* Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Eisenson, Jon, J. Jeffrey Auer, & John V. Irwin. *The Psychology of Communication.* N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Ehninger, Douglas & Wayne Brockriede. *Decision by Debate*. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1963.

Freeley, Austin J. *Argumentation and Debate: Rational Decision Making*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1961.

Haiman, Franklyn. *Group Leadership and Democratic Action.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.

Harnack, R. Victor & Thorrel B. Fest. *Group Discussion - Theory and Technique*. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Keltner, John W. *Group Discussion Processes*. N. Y.: David McKay Co., Inc., 1957.

Lee, Irving J. *How to Talk With People*. N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1952.

Lewis, Thomas R. & Ralph G. Nichols. *Speaking and Listening*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, 1965.

McBurney, James H. & Kenneth G. Hance. *Discussion in Human Affairs*. Evanston: Harper & Row, 1950.

McBurney, James H. & Glen E. Mills. *Argumentation and Debate: Techniques of a Free Society*. Second Edition. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1964.

McBurney, James H. & Ernest J. Wrage. *Guide to Good Speech*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Miller, Gerald. *Speech Communication: A Behavioral Approach*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Mills, Glen E. *Reason in Controversy*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1964.

Minnick, Wayne. *The Art of Persuasion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957.

Newman, Robert P. and Dale R. *Fundamentals of Argument.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Nilsen, Thomas. *Ethics of Speech Communication*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

O'Neil, Robert M. *Free Speech: Responsible Communication Under Law*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Phillips, David C. and Jock Hall Lamb. *Speech As Communication.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.

Phillips, Gerald M. *Communication and the Small Group.* Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Reid, Ronald. *An Introduction to the Field of Speech.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1965.

Robert, Henry M. *Robert's Rules of Order.* Revised Edition. Chicago: Scott, Foresman Co., 1951.

Ross, Raymond. *Speech Communication: Fundamentals and Practice.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Schramm, Wilbur, Lang. Editor. *The Science of Human Communication: New Directions and New Findings in Communication Research.* N. Y.: Basic, 1963.

Sherif, Carolyn W., Muzafer Sherif, and Roger Nebergall. *Attitude and Attitude Change: The Social Judgement-Involvement Approach.* Philadelphia: Saunders, 1965.

Sturgis, Alice F. *Learning Parliamentary Procedure.* N. Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Walter, Otis M. and Robert L. Scott. *Thinking and Speaking.* N. Y.: Macmillan, 1962.

Wilson, John F. and Carrol C. Arnold. *Public Speaking as a Liberal Art.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1964.

Windes, Russell R. and Arthur Hastings. *Argumentation and Advocacy.* N. Y.: Random House, 1965.

## PHILOSOPHY AND METHODOLOGY OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Buys, William E. "Speech Curricula for All American Youth," *The Speech Teacher*, XV, January (1966), 20-25.

Eckelmann, Dorothy H. and Margaret Parret. "Source Material for Speech in the Elementary School," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXVI, April (1950), 251-259.

Fest, Thorrel B. "The Speech Curriculum for American Youth: An Introduction," *The Speech Teacher*, XV, January (1966), 11-12.

Flower, F. D. *Language and Education.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1966.

Gibson, James W. and Robert J. Kibler. "Creative Thinking in the Speech Classroom. A Bibliography of Related Research," *The Speech Teacher*, XIV, January (1965), 30-34.

Hahn, Elise. "An Analysis of the Content and Form of the Speech of First Grade Children," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXIV, October (1948).

Hahn, Elise. "An Analysis of the Delivery of the Speech of First Grade Children," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXV, October (1949).

Hahn, Elise. "A Speech Curriculum to Meet the Needs of the Elementary School Child," *The Speech Teacher*, I, March (1952), 109-110.

Harris, Mary I. *A Curriculum Guide for Speech Arts in the Primary Grades*. Ed. D. Dissertation. Tulsa: University of Tulsa, 1963.

Huckleberry, Alan W. and Edward S. Strother. *Speech Education for the Elementary Teacher*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

Keltner, John. "Speech For All American Youth: Current Issues and Problems," *The Speech Teacher*, XV, January (1966), 11-17.

Kosh, Zelda H. "Helping Children Develop Effective Oral Communication," *The Speech Teacher*, VI, March (1957), 123.

Kramer, Magdalene. "The Role of Speech in Education: A Re-Evaluation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXIV, April (1948).

*Language Arts in the Elementary School*. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Vol. 20, July (1941).

Oberle, Marcella. "A Contemporary View of Elementary Speech Education," *The Speech Teacher*, IX, November (1960), 267-270.

Ogilvie, Mardel. "Creative Speech Experience in the Elementary School," *The Speech Teacher*, VII, January (1958), 6-10.

Ogilvie, Mardel. "Oral Communication in Elementary School Living," *The Speech Teacher*, VI, January (1957), 43.

Ogilvie, Mardel. Speech in the Elementary School. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Ogilvie, Mardel, John Pruis, and Elise Hahn. "Bibliography of Speech in the Elementary School," The Speech Teacher, II, November (1953), 261-265.

Peins, Maryann. "Speech Training in the Qualification of the Elementary School Teacher," The Speech Teacher, V, March (1956), 132.

Piaget, Jean. The Language and Thought of the Child. London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd. 1926.

Piquette, Julia. "Needed: Adequate Speech Training for Elementary Education Majors," The Speech Teacher, IX, November (1960), 276-277.

Pooley, Robert C. "Oral Communication in English Curriculum," The Speech Teacher, XV, January (1966), 26-29.

Pronovost, Wilbert. The Teaching of Speaking and Listening in the Elementary School. New York: Longmans, Green, 1959.

Pruis, John. "Why Teach Speech in the Elementary School," The Speech Teacher, I, January (1952), 37.

Rasmussen, Carrie, Editor. Guides to Speech Training in the Elementary School. A Report of the Elementary Committee of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. Boston: Expression Co., 1943.

Rasmussen, Carrie, Editor. The Role of Speech in the Elementary School. Washington: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1946-47.

Rasmussen, Carrie. Speech Methods in the Elementary School. N. Y.: Ronald Press, 1949.

"The Field of Speech: Its Purposes and Scope in Education," The Speech Teacher, XII, November (1963), 331-335.

Smith, Donald K. "Speech for Tomorrow," The Speech Teacher, XV, January (1966), 30-33.

Wallace, Karl R., Editor. A History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies, N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Walter, Otis M. "On the Teaching of Speech as a Force in Western Culture," The Speech Teacher, XI, January (1962), 1-9.

## ORAL INTERPRETATION OF CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

### Children's Literature

Arbuthnot, May Hill. Children and Books. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1947.

Huck, Charlotte S. and Doris A. Young. Children's Literature in the Elementary School. N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Jacobs, Leland B. Using Literature with Young Children. N. Y.: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1965.

Kiefer, Monica. American Children Through Their Books, 1700-1835. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.

Smith, Lillian H. The Unreluctant Years--A Critical Approach to Children's Literature. Chicago: American Library Association, 1953.

Viquers, Ruth Hill. Margin for Surprise. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.

Witty, Paul, Editor. Creative Writing and Story Telling in Today's Schools. Reprint from Elementary English, March, 1957. Distributed by Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., 1957.

### Information for the Oral Reader of Poetry and Prose

Aristotle. On the Art of Poetry. Translated Lane Cooper. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1913.

Armstrong, Chloe and Paul D. Brandes. The Oral Interpretation of Literature. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Bacon, Wallace A. The Art of Interpretation. N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1966.

Bacon, Wallace A. and Robert S. Breen. Literature as Experience. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Bamman, Henry A., Mildren A. Dawson, and Robert J. Whitehead. Oral Interpretation of Children's Literature. Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1964.

Campbell, Paul N. *Oral Interpretation*. N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Geeting, Baxter M. *Interpretation for our Time.* Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1966.

Grimes, Wilma H. and Alethea S. Mattingly. *Interpretation - Writer, Reader, Audience*. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1961.

Lee, Charlotte I. *Oral Interpretation*. 3rd Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

Lowrey, Sara and Gertrude Johnson. *Interpretive Reading*. Revised Edition. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Perrine, Lawrence. *Sound and Sense*. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956.

## Story Telling

Abernethy, Rose L. *A Study of Existing Practices and Principles of Storytelling for Children in the United States*, Ph. D. Dissertation. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1964.

Betzner, J. *Exploring Literature with Children.* Practical Suggestions for Teaching, No. 7. N. Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1943.

Bryant, Sara Cone. *How to Tell Stories to Children.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1905.

Sawyer, Ruth. *Way of the Storyteller*. N. Y.: Viking Press, Inc., 1957.

Shedlock, Marie L. *The Art of the Storyteller*. 3rd Edition. N. Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 1951.

*Storytelling.* Washington, D. C. Association for Childhood Education, 1945.

Thorne - Thomsen, Gudrun. *Storytelling and Stories I Tell.* N. Y.: Viking Press.

Wagner, Joseph A. and Robert W. Smith. *The Teacher's Guide to Storytelling*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1958.

Wyenn, Than R. *Art of Telling a Story*. Los Angeles: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1965.

Campbell, Paul N. *Oral Interpretation*. N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Geeting, Baxter M. *Interpretation for our Time.* Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1966.

Grimes, Wilma H. and Alethea S. Mattingly. *Interpretation - Writer, Reader, Audience.* San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1961.

Lee, Charlotte I. *Oral Interpretation.* 3rd Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

Lowrey, Sara and Gertrude Johnson. *Interpretive Reading*. Revised Edition. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Perrine, Lawrence. *Sound and Sense*. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956.

## Story Telling

Abernethy, Rose L. *A Study of Existing Practices and Principles of Storytelling for Children in the United States*, Ph. D. Dissertation. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1964.

Betzner, J. *Exploring Literature with Children.* Practical Suggestions for Teaching, No. 7. N. Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1943.

Bryant, Sara Cone. *How to Tell Stories to Children.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1905.

Sawyer, Ruth. *Way of the Storyteller*. N. Y.: Viking Press, Inc., 1957.

Shedlock, Marie L. *The Art of the Storyteller*. 3rd Edition. N. Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 1951.

*Storytelling.* Washington, D. C. Association for Childhood Education, 1945.

Thorne - Thomsen, Gudrun. *Storytelling and Stories I Tell.* N. Y.: Viking Press.

Wagner, Joseph A. and Robert W. Smith. *The Teacher's Guide to Storytelling*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1958.

Wyenn, Than R. *Art of Telling a Story*. Los Angeles: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1965.

## Choral Reading

Abney, Louise. *Choral Speaking Arrangements for Junior High.* Revised. Boston: Expression Co., 1959.

Abney, Louise. *Choral Speaking Arrangements for the Upper Grades.* Boston: Expression Co., 1937.

Abney, Louise and Grace Row. *Choral Speaking Arrangements for the Lower Grades.* Boston: Expression Co., 1937.

DeBanke, Cecile. *The Art of Choral Speaking.* Boston: Baker Plays, 1937.

DeWitt, Marguerite E. *Practical Methods in Choral Speaking.* Boston: Expression Co., 1936.

Enfield, Gertrude. *Verse Choir Values and Technique.* Boston: Expression Co., 1937.

Garrison, Geraldine. "Bibliography of Choral Speaking in the Elementary School," *The Speech Teacher*, III, March (1954), 107.

Gullen, Marjorie. *Choral Speaking.* London: Methuen, 1957.

Gullen, Marjorie. *The Speech Choir.* N. Y.: Harper, 1937.

Gullen, Marjorie and P. Gurrey. *Poetry Speaking for Children.* Boston: Expression Co., 1941.

Hamm, Agnes. *Choral Speaking Techniques.* Milwaukee: Tower Press, 1946.

Harding, George. *Choral Speaking as an Educational Device.* Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1954.

Hughes, Rosalind. *Let's Enjoy Poetry.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.

Keppie, Elizabeth, Conrad Wedberg, and Mariam Kesler. *Speech Improvement through Choral Speaking.* Boston: Expression Co., 1942.

Rasmussen, Carrie. *Choral Speaking for Speech Improvement.* Boston: Expression Co., 1939.

Rasmussen, Carrie. *Let's Say Poetry Together.* Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1963.

Raubicheck, Letitia. *Choral Speaking is Fun.* 2 Vols. N. Y.: Noble and Noble, 1955 and 1958.

Swann, Mona. *Many Voices.* London: General Howe, 1934.

## Source Materials

Aldis, Dorothy. *All Together.* N. Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1952.

American Library Association. *Subject and Title Index to Short Stories for Children.* Chicago, 1955.

Arbuthnot, May Hill. *The Arbuthnot Anthology of Children's Literature.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1952.

Barchilon, Jacques and Henry Pettit. *The Authentic Mother Goose Fairy Tales and Nursery Rhymes.* Denver: Alan Swallow, 1960.

Bowman, James Cloyd. *Pecos Bill.* Chicago: A. Whitman, 1937.

Colum, Padroic. Editor. *Arabian Nights.* N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1953.

Colum, Padroic. *Children of Odin.* N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1920.

De la Mare, Walter. *Come Hither.* New Edition. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1957.

Johnson, Edna, Evelyn R. Sickels, and Frances Clarke Sayers. *Anthology of Children's Literature.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Just So Stories.* N. Y.: Garden City Books, 1952.

Lear, Edward. *The Complete Book of Nonsense.* N. Y.: Dodd, Mead and Co., Inc., 1948.

Milne, A. A. *The World of Christopher Robin.* Whittlesey House, 1958.

*Miracles: Poems by Children of the English-Speaking World.* Collected by Richard Lewis. N. Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1966.

Neeson, Eoin. *The First Book of Irish Myths and Legends.* Cork: The Mercier Press.

Rasmussen, Carrie. *Playtime Poems for Tiny Tots.* New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1961.

Rasmussen, Carrie. *Poems for Playtime.* Boston: Expression Co., 1941.

Richards, Laura E. *Tirra Lirra.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1955.

Roberts, Elizabeth Madox. *Under the Tree.* N. Y.: The Viking Press, Inc., 1930.

Rossetti, Christina. *Sing Song.* N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1952.

Sell, V. G. et al. *Subject Index to Poetry for Young People.* American Library Association, 1957.

Shephard, Esther. *Paul Bunyan.* N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace, 1924.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *A Child's Garden of Verses.* N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

Untermeyer, Louis. *The Golden Treasury of Poetry.* N. Y.: The Golden Press, 1959.

## CREATIVE DRAMA

### *Creative Education*

Anderson, Harold. Editor. *Creativity and Its Cultivation.* Evanston: Harper & Row, 1959.

Beal, C. Newton. *The Creative Spirit.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Evanston:

Cole, Natalie. *The Arts in the Classroom.* N. Y.: The John Day Co., 1940.

Dewey, John. *Art and Education.* Second Edition. N. Y.: The Barnes Foundation Press, 1947.

Dewey, John. *Art as Experience.* N. Y.: Milton-Balch, 1934.

Dixon, C. Madeline. *High, Wide and Deep.* N. Y.: The John Day Co., 1938.

Frye, Northrop. *The Educated Imagination.* Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1964.

Fuelop-Miller. "Creativity and the Individual," *The Conference on Creativity: A Report to the Rockefeller Foundation.* Columbus: Ohio State University, 1953.

Ghiselin, Brewster, Editor. *The Creative Process: A Symposium.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952.

Hartman, Gertrude and Ann Shumaker, Editors. *Creative Expression: The Development of Children in Art, Music, Literature, and Dramatics.* Edited for the Progressive Education Association. N. Y.: The John Day Co., 1928.

Hill, Wilhemina, Helen K. Mockentosh, and Arne Randall. *How Children Can Be Creative.* Bulletin No. 12. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Dept. of Health, Educ. & Welfare, 1954.

Hutchinson, Eliot Dole. *How to Think Creatively.* N. Y.: Abingdon-Cokebury Press.

Koestler, Arthur. *The Act of Creation.* N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1964.

Lowenfeld, Viktor. *The Nature of Creative Activity.* N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1939.

Lowenfeld, Viktor. *Your Child and His Art.* N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1954.

Maritain, Jacques. *Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry.* N. Y.: Pantheon Books, 1953.

McCauley, Millicent A. *Creative Expression in the Elementary School.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1958.

Mearnes, Hughes. *Creative Power.* Revised. N. Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958.

Mearnes, Hughes. *Creative Youth.* N. Y.: Doubleday, 1928.

Osborn, Alexander F. *Applied Imagination.* N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Osborn, Alexander F. *Your Creative Power.* N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Patrick, Catherine. *What Is Creative Thinking?* N. Y.: Philosophical Library Inc., 1955.

Paschall, Alma. *Creative Expression.* Evanston: Harper & Row, 1933.

*Recommendations.* Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth, No. 157. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Rogers, Carl. "Toward a Theory of Creativity," *The Conference on Creativity: A Report to the Rockefeller Foundation.* Columbus: Ohio State University, 1953.

Smith, Paul. *Creativity.* N. Y.: Hastings House, 1959.

Struck, Ferdinand T. *Creative Teaching.* N. Y.: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1938.

Wilson, Robert C. "Creativity," *Education for the Gifted.* National Society for the Study of Education, 1958.

Witt, Mariam E. *Creativity in the Elementary School.* Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Zacharias, Jerrold R. "The Age of Science," *The Nation's Children.* Editor, Eli Ginzberg. Prepared for 1960 White House Conference on Children & Youth. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, II, 1960.

### *Creative Dramatics*

Andrews, Gladys. *Creative Rhythmic Movement for Children.* N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, 1947.

Blank, Earl. *The Effectiveness of Creative Dramatics in Developing Voice, Vocabulary, and Personality in the Primary Grades.* Ph. D. Dissertation. Denver: University of Denver, 1953.

Brown, Helen. *The Account of an Experiment Showing the Effects of a Year's Work in Creative Dramatics.* Master's Thesis. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1936.

Burger, Isobel. *Creative Playacting.* N. Y.: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1950.

Chambers, Robert E. *Creative Dramatics: Learning or Play? A Study of Three Informal Educational Situations.* Master's Thesis. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956.

Ervine, Jean. "Bibliography of Dramatics in the Elementary School," *The Speech Teacher,* III, December (1954).

Fitzgerald, Burdette. *Let's Act the Story.* San Francisco: Fearon Publishers, 1957.

Haaga, Agnes and Patricia Randles. *Supplementary Materials for Use in Creative Dramatics with Younger Children.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1952.

Lewis, George L., "Children's Theatre & Creative Dramatics: A Bibliography," *Educational Theatre Journal,* VIII, May (1955), 338-45.

Popovich, James E. *A Study of Significant Contributions to the Development of Creative Dramatics in American Education.* Ph. D. Dissertation. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1955.

Siks, Geraldine B. *Children's Literature for Dramatization: An Anthology.* Evanston: Harper and Row, 1964.

Siks, Geraldine B. *Creative Dramatics: An Art for Children.* Evanston: Harper and Row, 1958.

Siks, Geraldine B. & Hazel B. Dunnington, Editors. *Children's Theatre and Creative Dramatics.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1961.

Taylor, Loren E. *An Introduction to Dramatics for Children.* Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1965.

Taylor, Loren E. *Storytelling and Dramatization.* Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1965.

Ward, Winifred. *Creative Dramatics.* N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1930.

Ward, Winifred. *Drama With and for Children.* Bulletin 1960, No. 30. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1960.

Ward, Winifred. *Playmaking with Children.* Revised. N. Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Ward, Winifred. *Stories to Dramatize.* Anchorage, Kentucky: The Children's Theater Press, 1952.

Woods, Margaret S. *A Survey of Effective Practices in Creative Dramatics in the Classroom.* Master's Thesis. Seattle: University of Washington, 1954.

## Puppetry

Batchelder, Marjorie and Virginia Lee Comer. *Puppets and Plays: A Creative Approach.* Evanston: Harper and Row, 1956.

Blackham, Olive. *Shadow Puppets.* Evanston: Harper and Row, 1960.

Bufano, Remo. *Magic Strings.* N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1939.

Bussell, J. and A. Hogarth. *Marionettes: How to Make Them.* Detcaling, Sussex: St. Dominic's Press, 1934.

Cummings, Richard. *101 Hand Puppets.* N. Y.: David McKay Co., 1962.

Foreman, Helen and Wheeler, Blanche. *Let's Make a Puppet.* Saint Paul: The Webb Publishing Co., 1947.

Ficklen, Bessie Alexander. *A Handbook of Fist Puppets.* N. Y.: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1935.

Fletcher, Helen, Jill and Deckter, Jack. *The Puppet Book.* N. Y.: Greenberg Publishing, 1947.

Gambee, Budd L. *Puppet Film List.* Master's Thesis. Munsie, Indiana: Ball State Teacher's College, 1957.

Garrison, Geraldine. "Bibliography of Puppetry for the Elementary School," *The Speech Teacher*, III, September (1954).

Hastings, S. and D. Ruthenberg. *How to Produce Puppet Plays.* Evanston: Harper and Row, 1940.

Hoben, Alice M. *Puppets and Marionettes.* Chicago: Field Enterprises, Inc., 1955. (Reprinted from the *Modern Childcraft*)

Howard, Vernon. *Puppets and Pantomime Plays.* N. Y.: Sterling Publishing Co., Inc., 1962.

Jackendorf, Moritz. *The First Book of Puppets.* N. Y.: Franklin Watts, Inc., 1952.

Lewis, Shari. *The Shari Lewis Puppet Book.* N. Y.: Citadel Press, 1958.

Mills, Winifred and Louise Dunn. *Marionettes, Masks, and Shadows.* N. Y.: Doubleday, 1927.

*Puppetry in the Curriculum.* Curriculum Bulletin No. 1. N. Y.: Board of Education of City of New York, 1947-48.

Rasmussen, Carrie and Caroline Storck. *Funtime Puppets.* Chicago: Children's Press, 1952.

Schmidt, Hans Josef. *The Puppet as an Actor.* Chicago: The Coach House Press, 1955.

Stoddard, A. and Tony Sarg. *A Book of Marionette Plays.* N. Y.: Greenberg, 1927.

## SPEECH IMPROVEMENT

Abney, Louise and D. Miniace. *This Way to Better Speech.* Yonkers: World, 1940.

Ainsworth, Stanley. *Galloping Sounds.* Boston: Expression Co.

Backus, Ollie L. *Speech in Education: A Guide for the Classroom Teacher.* N. Y.: Longmans, 1943.

Barrows, Sara T. and Katherine H. Hall. *Games and Jingles for Speech Development.* Boston: Expression Co., 1936.

Berry, Mildred F. and Jon Eisenson. *Speech Disorders: Principles and Practices of Therapy.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Best, Isabel. *Speech Training in the Primary School in Story and Rhyme.* London: Macmillan, 1942.

Birch, Jack W., Jack Matthews and Ernest Burgi. *Improving Children's Speech.* Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1958.

Bryngelson, Bryng and Esther Glospey. *Speech Improvement Cards.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1951.

Burgi, Ernest J., Jack W. Birch, and Jack Matthews. *Manual for Effective Use - My Sound Book - Best Speech Series.* Pittsburgh, Pa.: Stanwix House, Inc., 1960.

Byrne, Margaret C. *The Child Speaks: A Speech Improvement Program.* Evanston: Harper & Row, 1964.

Cose, I. M. and S. T. Barrows. *Speech Drills for Children in the Form of Play.* Boston: Expression Co., 1929.

Cotrel, Edna and Elizabeth Holsted. *Class Lessons for Improving Speech.* Boston: Expression Co., 1936.

Curtis, Agnes and Kathleen Smith, Editors. *Guides for Speech Improvement in the Elementary School.* Columbus: Ohio Public Schools, 1957.

Cypreansen, Lucile, John H. Wiley and Leroy T. Laase. *Speech Development, Improvement, and Correction - Methods and Materials for the Classroom Teacher and the Speech Therapist.* N. Y.: Ronald Press, 1959.

Eisenson, Jon and Ogilvie, Mardel. *Speech Correction in the Schools.* 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1963.

Eisenson, Jon. *The Improvement of Voice and Diction.* N. Y.: Macmillan, 1965.

Fairbanks, Grant. *Voice and Articulation Drillbook.* Evanston: Harper & Row, 1940.

Gordon, Morton and Helene Wong. *A Manual for Speech Improvement.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Grasham, John A. and Glenn Gooder. *Improving Your Speech.* N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1960.

Gray, Giles W. and Claude M. Wise. *The Bases of Speech.* Revised. Evanston: Harper & Row, 1959.

Hanley, Theodore and Wayne L. Thurman. *Developing Vocal Skills.* N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1962.

Hemphill, E. Irene. *Choral Speaking and Speech Improvement.* Darien, Conn.: Teachers Publishing Corp., 1960.

Hutchison, Elizabeth L. and Shirley B. Quinn. *Listen-Look-Say.* Cambridge, Mass.: Educators Publishing Service, 1960.

Kenyon, J. S. and T. A. Knott. *A Pronouncing Dictionary.* Springfield, Mass.: G. C. Merriam, 1953.

Leutenegger, Ralph R. *The Sounds of American English: An Introduction to Phonetics.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1963.

Manser, Ruth B. *Speech Improvement on the Contract Plan.* 3rd edition. N. Y.: Chilton Company, 1961.

Nemoy, Elizabeth. *Speech Correction Through Storytelling Units.* Boston: Expression Co., 1954.

Ogilvie, Mardel and Jon Eisenson. *Speech Correction in the Schools.* N. Y.: Macmillan, 1963.

Schoolfield, Lucile D. *Better Speech & Better Reading.* Revised. Boston: Expression Co., 1951.

Scott, Louise B. and J. J. Thompson. *Speech Ways.* St. Louis: Webster Co., 1955.

Scott, Louise B. and J. J. Thompson. *Talking Time.* Revised. McGraw-Hill, 1965.

*Speech in the Elementary School.* Los Angeles City School District, 1949.

Spooner, Jane R. *Tony Plays with Sounds.* N. Y.: The John Day Company, 1961.

*Toward Better Speech, A Manual for Teachers of All Grades.* Brooklyn: New York City Board of Education, 1953.

Van Riper, Charles. *Helping Children Talk Better.* Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1951.

Van Riper, Charles and Katherine Butler. *Speech in the Elementary Classroom.* Evanston: Harper & Row, 1955.

Van Riper, Charles. *Your Child's Speech Problems.* Evanston: Harper & Row, 1961.

Wise, Claude M. *Applied Phonetics.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Zedler, Empress. *Listening for Speech Sounds.* N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1955.

## RECORDS

Scott, Louise B., Lucille F. Wood., and Naoma Zimmerman. *Listening Time.* Los Angeles: Rowman Records.

Wilcox, Edna and Barbara McIntyre. *Listening With Mr. Bunny Big Ears.* Freeport, New York: Educational Activities, Inc., 1965.

Van Horn, Hazel and Charles Van Riper. *Fun With Speech.* Encyclopedia Britannica Films.

## FILMSTRIPS

Scott, Louise B. *Talking Times.*

# COMPOSITION

Dorothy Saunders
Third Grade Teacher
Brookmont School
4800 Sangamore Road
Washington, D. C.

Composition is an area of extreme insecurity for most, I might even say "nearly all," teachers. Within her classroom, the teacher protects herself by following carefully the demands of text and curriculum staying closely with those exercises which provide something she can easily identify in terms of a grade. She fills the required periods per week with composition of a functional sort, rarely adventuring into the realm of imaginative writing except as an uneasy but necessary journey. She feels creative writing is "a good thing" but scarcely knows what to do with it beyond having the author edit and make a neat copy. She feels comfortable only when compositions attain a neat mechanical perfection.

And why shouldn't she feel uneasy? She is herself the product of teaching which, rather than helping students to write, taught them to discover ways to avoid writing. How many teachers in the last year, the last five years--since the days of hidden notebooks in which ten or twelve year olds inscribed tales wistful or violent--how many have written anything at all not absolutely required by affection, courtesy, business--or courses in education? Not one in a hundred--not one in five hundred. And what is their attitude toward the writing they have to do? Eagerness, procrastination, gratification, downright discomfort?

I talked recently with a group of teachers in a relatively sophisticated system who wanted to improve their teaching of composition. None of them did any writing except as situations demanded and most volunteered that they dreaded required written reports on school projects. When I asked if they would be interested in an institute in composition, their immediate response was an enthusiastic affirmative but the suggestion that a part of the course would be devoted to the improvement of their own writing brought a swift reversal by some and a hedging by others. In further conversation they indicated they were really concerned about their own inadequacy but even more concerned that their children should not develop the dread of writing which still haunts them. And finally they agreed that they would benefit by and even enjoy improving their own writing IF they were not graded as college students and did not have to perform in class.

If the reaction of these teachers is, as I believe, more or less typical of others, then one important task of the institute course must be to do something about freeing teachers from this burden of inadequacy by helping them to improve their own writing in an atmosphere both considerate and supportive. Individual conferences should be used for evaluation and the establishment of new aims.

Another aspect of the course must be the teaching of composition in the elementary classroom. Here, too, the matter of attitude toward writing has long been neglected. Evaluation of writing programs has usually encompassed only skills while the attitude of the student towards his writing has been given little attention. In a suburban community an informal survey was conducted recently in which 150 sixth graders were asked to list school subjects in order of their enjoyment of them. Language, the nomenclature for the course in composition and grammar, was ranked first by eight students, second by six, but fifth (after Reading, Social Studies, Science and Math) by 94. This, and other evidence indicating that students leave elementary school with a well developed dislike of composition, raises the question as to whether we are not continuing the mistakes of the past which produced the sense of inadequacy to which so many teachers confess.

The accusations of poor preparation passed down from the colleges to the high school, to the junior high and finally to the elementary school usually cite only the lack of competence in the mechanics of writing. Is it possible that these charges have so focussed attention on the mechanical requirements of composition that teachers have overlooked the fact that for children, no less than for themselves, it is confidence and enthusiasm that create the thrust towards growth? It is encouraging that there are schools where writing is exciting, where children find real satisfaction in this activity and where their achievements also meet high standards of effectiveness.

This second aspect of the course should be concerned not with new tricks of the trade but a searching consideration of what understandings on the part of the teacher, what approaches to the teaching of composition will secure for children not only a reasonable competence but a sense of power and delight, as well. Of essential importance to this aim is the opportunity to observe demonstration classes taught by experts. Indeed, it is hard to conceive of the course without a demonstration school. Tapes and films, even of excellent teaching quality, would be a poor substitute.

The two principal purposes of the course are so completely compatible that they can be pursued concurrently with the expectation that the values discovered in one area will strengthen the understandings developed in the other.

It is impossible to embrace all aspects of composition in a six or eight week course. Hard choices have to be made. The course I envision consists of four main topics: The Nature of Composition, Utilitarian Writing, Personal Writing, Scope and Sequence. Each of these will be considered in terms of what it can contribute to the teacher's own writing and to the teaching of composition in her classroom.

The first area of concern, The Nature of Composition, is designed to help the teacher discern those qualities common to all effective composition and to arouse her interest in and extend her understanding of the potential of our language. The central element of this section will be the study of a selected body of literature, both poetry and prose. The approach will be discovery and appreciation rather than dissection. As the teacher becomes sensitive to the qualities of great writing, she will be encouraged to look for the operation of these qualities in the simple writing of children and to observe how, in her own writing, she has to ally herself with the same purposes. In addition, some aspects of syntax and rhetoric will be considered. Sentence and paragraph structure will be reviewed. Developmental patterns of speech and language as they affect composition will be discussed. Obviously all these matters cannot be treated in depth but are included because they present problems in teachers' writing and hamper their efforts to help children in their composition. In lectures and discussions, in assigned reading, in individual conferences concerning her own writing, the teacher will develop a growing awareness of the nature of composition and discover ways in which these new understandings can be used to improve her own writing and help her to recognize and value good writing when it appears in her classroom.

Following this topic are two dealing with phases of writing. One is the practical functional writing which serves as direct communication; the other is personal writing which is concerned with self-expression for its own sake, with imagination and inner experience. Both phases are important; though separate in purpose, each supports and enriches the other. Although the focus of these topics will be on the teaching of composition, the teacher will continue her own writing which will parallel concerns of the course. Her assignments will be in exposition when the teaching of functional writing is being studied. When personal writing is under consideration, she will have opportunities to experiment with writing of an imaginative or carefree nature. Because practical writing comprises the major part of a child's writing and all, except in rare cases, of an adult's, it is treated first.

The broad and ever-expanding curriculum of the elementary school presents a multiplicity of demands for functional writing:

memos, reports, notes, letters, records, captions, to name a few. Composition takes place not within a neatly labelled period but wherever it serves a purpose. The stating of a situation problem in arithmetic, the planning of a slogan for a bulletin board, the planning of a caption for a picture all involve the effective use of writing skills. Because the need for writing is genuine and important, because the child has clearly in mind the audience for whom he is writing, he feels keenly the need for clarity and accuracy and is willing to strive for it. Since, in most cases, what he writes is to be read by others, courtesy as well as convention requires that it be neat and mechanically correct. The need for effective communication sets high but attainable standards.

The teacher, observing demonstration classes, will see how writing skills develop when the child's commitment is to a genuine purpose. She will observe more than one grade in order to note the growth of skills and the variation of ability in any one grade.

A widely assorted volume of children's practical writing will be available for study. This will include some collections of clear copy accompanied by the rough drafts. Such an exhibit will help teachers analyze the kind of help and support different children may need. It will also be possible to study samples of a single type of writing at various grade levels and to follow the development of a special skill over a period of years. Samples will also be selected for clinical study of applicable teaching techniques.

The following topics will be presented in lectures and discussions:

The dictation of young children
The relationship of oral to written expression
The influence of a known audience on the search for and organization of information
Honest note-taking and the avoidance of plagiarism
Importance of time to assimilate information
Relationship of clear understanding to effective structure
Problems of organization
Maintaining interest for an extended project
Steps in the development of writing skills
The false standard of length
Common syntactical problems
Methods of evaluation

The expository writing in which the teacher will be engaged at this time may be related to the material of the course. As she writes, watches children writing, and studies practical writing, she will, hopefully, see that while there is a wide difference in the levels of composition, the problems encountered are basically the same, the need for assurance and approval the same.

Her developing empathy will be as influential in the improvement of her teaching as her clearer understanding of effective techniques. Too often a teacher acts as an aloof spectator of a writing activity, waiting to check errors and administer a grade. This section will not only provide her with a design for classroom procedures but also help her to see that it is as necessary for a child to have pride in his achievement and confidence in his ability to grow as it is for him to acquire writing skills.

The third topic of this course is Personal Writing, the joyous free writing that springs from imagination or inner experience. This is, without a doubt, the most neglected aspect of children's writing. Once again the teacher's own sense of inadequacy limits her interest and gives rise to an attitude of irresponsibility. Even though she may conscientiously allocate time for creative writing, she has no clearly defined aims for the activity beyond letting children have fun. Others, aware of the excellent writing done in a few schools, really give children freedom and encouragement to write but don't know what to do with the story when it is finished other than have the author edit and make a clear copy.

Particularly in the upper grades personal writing is neglected. Here the ever increasing demands for practical writing arising from the burgeoning curriculum, compounded by the popular equating of length with quality, leave little time for writing for personal pleasure. The old adage, "All work and no play. . . ," applies neatly here. Practical writing requires a high degree of concentration and perseverance. The satisfaction of a successfully accomplished communication is great but the road has been long and often tiresome.

Children need also another kind of writing experience in which they are free to put everything else aside and with heady unconcern for mechanics and properties, fashion a story or catch an impression. But a child is not truly free to write unless he is sure of a responsive audience for his completed tale. It is the teacher who must create a suitable ambience for experimenting with the craft of story telling. While a child may learn much about what makes writing vital from watching the way the class reacts to his story, and may learn even more when he seeks to identify what is good in the stories of others, it is the teacher who by her special approval of good writing as it appears lifts to the children's consciousness those elements of design that give vigor and spirit to their writing. Without the teacher's subtle and skillful involvement, personal writing soon falters and halts.

The purpose of this section of the course is to help the teacher to understand the many values of personal writing and to see the importance of her role in this activity. She will observe personal writing in the demonstration classes, watching the whole productive cycle from invention, to writing, to presentation, to the thrust of gratification which propels the child to new efforts. She will also be able to see the dynamic interaction of audience and author. She will examine quantities of children's writing, some good and some weak, becoming familiar with the surging invention which is characteristic of the elementary school child, and growing in her ability to seek out what is original and worth approval in even a poor tale. There will be individual case studies in which she can discern what growth is possible and how differently each child grows. This reading will give her background for lectures and discussion on the following topics:

Dictated stories in the early grades
Character invention
Productive interaction of author and audience
Blocks to writing
Story epidemics
The unfinished story
Growth and control of skills
When to edit
Publications
Transfer of learnings from personal to practical writing

For her own writing during this period, teachers will be invited--not required but invited, in line with the philosophy on which her own leadership will be based, to join in some free writing activities such as character invention and story writing. Particular care will be taken to keep this experience a congenial one. It would be utterly defeating to describe ways in which to make personal writing a joyous experience for children if the teacher is made miserable by a demand for "joyous" writing! Experience has shown, however, that where a comfortable rapport has been established, the temptation to try one's hand at invention is rarely resisted for long although many adults cling to the assurance of anonymity.

Since children's poetry has qualities somewhat different from those of their stories, it is considered separately. The popular praise accorded meaningless jingles and contrived verse makes it vitally important to present children's poetry as the product of their innermost thoughts set forth in the graphic and lyrical language natural to children. Much of what they dictate or write when they seek beyond the easily accessible patterns for their own unique statement is clumsy and crude; some of it is movingly vivid and revealing. All of it is valuable when it represents the child's honest thinking.

Teachers will read quantities of poetry and poetic fragments written by children at various grade levels. They will study poetry files of individual children. A familiarity with this material will constitute background for a consideration of the teaching strategy which will make poetry writing available to children. Some of the topics to be discussed are:

Creating an interest in poetry
What children write about
Group poems
Poetry in the upper grades
Supporting experiences
Publication

As in the case of story writing, teachers will be invited but not pressed, to try poetic statement. If a supportive rapport is in operation even a timid soul may venture forth into this area.

The fourth section of the course considers the scope and sequence of composition in the elementary school. Its purpose is to acquaint the teacher with the sweep of growth from first grade through sixth and to see her particular level in terms of this perspective. It is a topic which may well be treated in a work shop, for it will be based on an inspection of courses of study, curricula, and current research. In addition to becoming at least acquainted with recent developments in the field of composition, each student will be asked to follow research on some topic of special interest. Plans for making the new insights they have gained at the institute effective in their own faculties will be discussed.

The final phase of the teacher's experience with her own writing will be an individual conference in which the instructor will help her to make a critical evaluation of her accumulated writing, not in terms of grades but progress. Specific gains, not only in her writing but in her understanding of the writing process, will be noted. Reasonable plans for fortifying gains and overcoming weaknesses will be made.

It is not expected that this course will make a teacher an expert writer. In fact, the quality of her writing may be but mildly improved. One important outcome will be her growing understanding of the writing process which will affect her attitude towards her own writing and her ability to teach composition. Throughout the course this process will be investigated, first in literature and then in children's writing and in her own. A realization of the universality of problems which an author, teacher or child, meets each on his own level, when he engages in an act of composition will engender a feeling of security and an expanding sense of adequacy for her teaching. If, when a child comes for help in a composition, she can say with her heart if not her voice, "I know--I know how bothersome this is," she will already have taken a long step towards aiding the youngster who probably needs assurance and support quite as much as technical assistance.

If the course awakens a new interest in the limitless possibilities of language the teacher will have an incentive for further improvement of her own writing. Certainly she will be better fitted to help children to become aware of the potential of language.

She will know the validity and effectiveness of the teaching techniques presented in the course because she has seen them demonstrated in the observation classes. She will be aware of the rewards for teacher as well as children implicit in the program. She will be familiar with the philosophy and principles on which the program is based. From examination of a large body of children's writing as well as study of curricula and research she will have knowledge of the scope of composition in the elementary school and will know what to expect at her grade level. She will, I hope, be eager to return to her classroom!

A summer course cannot work miracles. This one will serve its purposes well if for teachers and through them, for children, composition is not a threat but an invitation.

# A PROPOSED COURSE IN COMPOSITION:

## ONE COMPONENT IN A SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

### Assumptions Concerning the Institute

In the following description of a proposed course in composition for elementary school teachers, a number of things have been assumed. First, it is assumed that the institute will last not less than six weeks or longer than eight, with the possibility that, if it is seven or eight weeks in length, one of those weeks might be deferred to the middle of the following school year so that the important follow-up work could be done. Second, it is assumed that the institute would not be devoted solely to composition, but rather that a course in composition would be one component of an institute embracing other relevant subject matter in English as well. At a minimum, though composition might provide the main emphasis for the institute, some basic information about language and the study of language should either accompany or, better, precede the course in composition. The main purpose of this block of instruction would be to provide information about language, and to inculcate an attitude toward language, which would be fundamental to the teaching of any aspect of English. Third, it is assumed that, in order to do a proper job of raising the general competence of elementary school teachers in essential aspects of English instruction, it may be necessary to assume that each teacher would attend at least two institutes in successive summers. The problem is of course complicated by the need of these same teachers for institutes in the New Mathematics, in the New Science, in social studies--and, perhaps, before long, institutes in art and music. Perhaps what all this indicates is that the explosion of knowledge and the consequent curriculum revolution may soon make it necessary for the elementary schools to reorganize their staffs on the basis of subject-matter specialization.

### Assumptions About the Elementary School Curriculum in Composition

In drawing up the following description of a proposed institute course in composition for elementary school teachers, it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the kind of school curriculum in composition for which the teachers would be preparing themselves in the institute. The first of these assumptions is that both imaginative writing and factual writing ("personal" writing and "utilitarian" writing) will be taught in the elementary grades. It is assumed further that, from the earliest exercises in composition, whether spoken or written, these two modes of writing will be interwoven. That is, it is not proposed that children in the second or third grade do only imaginative writing and those in the fourth, fifth, and sixth do factual or expository writing. At any age of the elementary school (or for that matter, of the secondary school), children need the discipline and the opportunity that writing in both of these modes provides. The second assumption is that the word "composition" includes assignments in speaking as well as in writing. Although there are important differences between written and spoken language, the principles underlying their use are alike at far more points than they are different.[1] The child's first exercises in composition are likely to be oral--"show and tell" activity, dictation to the teacher, etc. And while assignments in writing can be introduced at an earlier age than is often thought possible, opportunities for exercises in oral composition ought to continue throughout both elementary and secondary school, closely integrated with the instruction in written composition. A third assumption is that instruction in composition will not take place within a given year in a specific composition "block" alone, but rather that opportunities for the study and practice of composition will arise as the child studies literature and language--and, for that matter, science, social studies, mathematics, and the other components of the elementary school curriculum. That is, composition, whether oral or written, should not take place in a vacuum but should be related in as many ways as possible to all the student's other work, in which he is obviously obliged to understand and make himself understood through language. The final assumption about the elementary school composition curriculum is that, in accordance with what we understand to be the general psychological and intellectual development of most children, the composition curriculum will move, in a general way, from the concrete to the abstract, from the simple to the complex, from chronological and and spatial patterns to the simpler varieties of logical arrangement. This progression would be visible both in imaginative writing and factual writing, as far as possible.

## Purposes of a Composition Course in an Elementary School Institute

There are three purposes which a composition course for elementary school teachers should accomplish: 1) The participants should be introduced to a systematic theory of discourse, both imaginative and factual. This means, on the one hand, an acquaintance with several of the principles of literary analysis and criticism, and on the other, a familiarity with the principles of rhetoric and, to a degree, logic. 2) The participants should apply these principles to writing of their own in both the imaginative and factual modes. The purpose of such exercises would be not only to consolidate their grasp of the principles in question but also, so far as it can be accomplished within the space of a few weeks, to improve the quality of their own writing and, by this means, make them more sensitive and more articulate about the writing of their students. 3) Finally, all the knowledge acquired in the institute course should be focused on the problem of teaching composition, both oral and written, in the elementary school classroom. This last may best be accomplished through a workshop and a demonstration class. The first two of these purposes will be the business of the composition course itself.

---

[1] The speech committee took exception to this position during the conference. PAO.

## Relations of the Composition Course to other Components of an Elementary School Institute

Since composition, whether oral or written, is an instrumental art, not one practiced for its own sake, the proposed course in composition will have obvious and necessary relations to other aspects of the English curriculum which, in all likelihood, will figure in most elementary school institutes. Especially in relation to the teaching of imaginative writing, literary works must be studied and literary principles must be derived. Especially at the level of the word and the sentence, the composition course must draw on insights provided by modern linguistic science. The relations to speech have already been mentioned earlier; that is, those aspects of oral discourse governed by the art of rhetoric can, it would appear, be more effectively studied in combination with instruction in written composition. Other aspects of speech, such as dialects, speech defects, etc., would be the business of a different course entirely. As for the relations of the composition course to reading, the course being proposed here would simply regard reading as an essential and related skill, not to be taught as part of this course but rather as a special course in its own right.

## Main Features of the Proposed Course in Composition

Just as it is assumed that the writing instruction in the elementary school classroom would embrace both imaginative and factual composition, so would the institute course provide instruction in both of these modes.

The study of imaginative writing would of course be closely related to the literature component of an elementary school institute though it would not be identical with it. At least some poetry and short fiction should be analyzed in the composition course for the express purpose of deriving principles of such composition for the guidance of exercises in writing. Probably only the shorter forms, both narrative and lyric, of verse should be studied; and certainly both free, as well as metrical, verse should be included. As for fiction, the purposes of the composition course could be adequately served by the study of short stories and short narrative sketches. In any case, it is important to emphasize that the particular poems or works of fiction studied should be chosen to illustrate principles of these modes of composition; they should not be picked on the basis of whether or not they might be read with enjoyment and understanding by elementary school children. (The latter consideration might well be the business of a unit on children's literature within a literature course.)

The analysis of literary models, then, will provide most of the principles needed to guide practice and instruction in imaginative writing, but it would be appropriate to do a limited amount of reading in critical essays dealing with literary theory. It would be advisable not to tread unduly upon the domain of the literature course. And, as suggested earlier, the participants' grasp of these principles should be tested by assignments calling for them to try their own hands at writing fictional sketches or short verse forms. These might well be ungraded so as to encourage spontaneity and free play of the imagination.

The teaching of factual writing and the theory underlying it will likely bulk larger in the course than the corresponding instruction in imaginative writing. The reason is that much of the work for the latter will be done in the literature course of the institute, whereas the close study of factual prose is customarily omitted or, if not, given much less attention. This means that a fairly complete theory of factual prose will have to be supplied within the compass of the course. The theory should be derived from the analysis of factual prose and from the study of works dealing with rhetorical principles. And, as recommended earlier, the teachers in the course should be allowed frequent opportunity to consolidate their learning by composing essays and other short pieces that will oblige them to apply the principles being studied.

Though there are many ways of organizing such a course, the following is offered as a workable possibility; no claim is made for the necessity of the items included or the irrelevancy of items omitted; and the order of items is only one of a number of possibilities.

The course might well begin with a consideration of what may be called rhetorical "imperatives": purpose, audience and the rhetorical persona of the writer or speaker created by the linguistic and rhetorical choices within a given composition. Theoretical consideration might be given to such matters as the point of view of the speaker/writer and the nature of his audience. To drive home these considerations, such written assignments as the following might be given:

- descriptions of a classroom from various points, such as the back row, the teacher's desk, the doorway.
- a short tale or anecdote or fable, told from the points of view of various of the characters in it.
- a problem in the classroom, as one might explain it to his student, the student's parent, and one's supervisor.

Following the study of these overriding concerns and some practice with them, the course might turn to the problem of rhetorical invention: the problem of discovering subject matter for writing or speaking and the associated problem of discovering what it is possible to say about the subject matter chosen. Written assignments for this portion of the course might range from an impossible assignment ("In the next twenty minutes, write me a page on Fynes Moryson's Itinerary," to pose a far-fetched one), calculated to dramatize the necessity for choosing subject matter within the ken of the student, through such a possibility as "Write me a page about this piece of chalk" (in which the initial horror of the participants might be relieved by a few suggestions: how does it look, feel, sound, smell, etc. ?), to such an assignment as the utilization of the common topics of Aristotle in the discussion of a hypothetical problem.

Next might come a study of structure--various ways of organizing a composition. The possible structural patterns which follow are by no means exhaustive, but offer possibilities for written assignments for participants and also suggest ideas for compositions in elementary grades. Simple verse structures such as the haiku and limerick are easily dealt with; and simple narrative forms, such as anecdote and fable, offer forms for students of all ages to manipulate. A number of logical structures which offer possibilities for writing in elementary school may also be considered. The logical method of classification underlies problems in the categorization of things, qualities, and conditions (leaves, rocks, books; colors, sizes and shapes, consistencies; things which will freeze or melt under certain conditions); and classification also underlies the method of definition (what is a freshman, a sibling, a parent, a dog, etc. ?) and that of comparison-contrast. The logical method of analysis yields assignments such as analyses of activities (playground or cafeteria), of characters (kinds of teachers, books, pets, friends), of systems of rules (games and sports), and of simple processes (how to dial a telephone). Rules of causation supply the logical framework for explaining innumerable phenomena. The method of generalization may be illustrated by assignments in problems of usage ("How many people discriminate shall and will, or who and whom, and when?"). Even the syllogism may be useful in such problems as those implicit in the fallacy of the undistributed middle term (Communists want us out of Viet Nam; Mr. Jones wants us out of Viet Nam; ergo ----?).

Next might come a detailed study of the rhetoric of the paragraph, accompanied by exercises in paragraph writing utilizing the various methods of paragraph development. After this might come a study of the sentence, from a rhetorical point of view. Here it would be assumed that the language component of the institute would have provided the participants with a sufficient knowledge of syntactic elements to enable them to talk intelligently about the rhetoric of the sentence. Exercises might include both analyses of sentences and creation of variations on a single kernel sentence.

Following this unit, the course might turn to the study of diction--problems of the individual word. Possible considerations might be a study of denotation and connotation, of semantic change and of word formation (though the last of these might well be covered in the language component of the institute). Accompanying or following the study of diction might come a study of usage, with the aim of insuring an informed attitude toward matters of usage as well as acquainting the participants with the status of the thirty or forty usages now often disputed.

The course might conclude with a study of English prose style, building on the analyses and exercises in composition that have gone before. Such exercises as attempting imitations of different styles suggest themselves immediately in connection with this portion of the course.

Throughout such a course the aim would be to keep in mind the participant as scholar and writer: lectures and readings on the theoretical framework of composition should be enforced with writing assignments which illustrate and clarify the principles studied. Hopefully, the participants will see in these two supplementary activities sources of compositional assignments at their various grade levels.

## Staffing

The course in composition should be taught by a university-level specialist in rhetoric and composition, though he should have the assistance of consultants and lecturers representing particular specialities. Depending on what other components may be present in the institute, consultants should be available in speech, creative writing, literary analysis, and linguistics. If the institute contains courses in, say, language and literature, the teachers of these courses might be asked to visit the composition course several times to talk about their particular subject as it relates specifically to rhetorical theory and practice.

## THE COLLOQUIUM

### Purpose

The major purpose of the colloquium is to provide an opportunity for the practical application of theory to the elementary classroom. In this part of the institute participants will observe composition lessons in an elementary school, study effective classroom procedures, examine materials written by children, work out methods of teaching children at a particular grade level, and hear specialists in child development and the arts of language--all in relation to a discussion of the practical implications of the theoretical concerns of the course.

### Content

A first task in the colloquium will be to give an overview of an elementary-school program in composition. All aspects of the language arts are related; oral and written expression are closely allied[2] and the young child normally needs to clarify and express ideas orally before he is able to write. Composition is a part of the total curriculum and includes every activity which requires language usage. In fact, many written language skills and abilities can best be developed through experiences in such areas as the social studies or science; moreover, functional writing experiences constitute an important part of a program in composition: when the child writes his name on a drawing or letter, he is using written language to communicate. Thus, class plans, letters, labels, announcements provide opportunities for growth in expressing ideas, and subject-matter reports, as in social studies or science, are vehicles for discursive writing. As children understand, select, and organize content in terms of specific purpose, they use logical patterns appropriate to their subject and to their ability to think. Colloquium activities will identify functional or discursive experiences appropriate for children of various ages and will evaluate samples of children's writing.

---

[2] The Speech Committee would wish to limit the application of the position to a more specific indication of where they are alike and where they differ. PAO.

Narration tends to be the most common form of expression of young children. Primary children tell about personal and imaginative experiences. Older children expand their stories into such forms as fables and tall tales. The development of children's story-telling ability from the first dictated account to the detailed story of the middle-grader should be demonstrated and discussed. Indeed, all forms of creative expression--creative dramatics, poetry, stories--should be discussed and analyzed in the colloquium in a discussion correlated with the discussions of children's literature.

Institute participants will be asked to bring varied samples of children's work. These will form part of the resource material for the colloquium. As participants look at these materials, they should observe how, in the elementary school, the child learns a complete set of written-language symbols, and a consideration of curriculum and instructional procedures relative to the development of skills in the handling of "written language symbols" and the linguistic conventions which go with these should form an important segment of the colloquium. Finally, classroom organization which facilitates individual attention, positive evaluative techniques, and realistic goals for child growth should also be demonstrated and discussed.

## Demonstration

For the purposes of observing the teaching of children in composition, demonstration classes should be available. These classes should represent various age-levels of elementary school children.

## Format

It is advisable that an institute group of forty or fifty be divided into two groups for the colloquium. Each group would have from twenty to twenty-five individuals. Each group should meet for two two-hour periods each week in addition to time spent in demonstration classes. Each week the total institute group should have a two-hour colloquium session with one of the specialists.

Three possible schedules are presented below. Any schedule adopted should be flexible enough to serve the needs of the participants and the skills of the leaders.

PLAN I -- Two groups divided arbitrarily

| | Mon. | Tues. | Wed. | Thurs. | Fri. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1:00-3:00 p.m. | group A | group B | total group | group A | group B |

PLAN II -- Two groups divided according to grade-level interest

| | Mon. | Tues. | Wed. | Thurs. | Fri. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1:00-3:00 p.m. | Primary teachers | Intermediate grade teachers | total group | Primary teachers | Intermediate grade teachers |

PLAN III -- Two groups with a leader for each group

| | Mon. | Tues. | Wed. | Thurs. | Fri. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1:00-3:00 p.m. | group X<br>group Y | free for other activities | total group | group X<br>group Y | free for other activities |

### Staffing

The colloquium should be led by an elementary education specialist and assisted by others as needed. The leader will serve as coordinator of observations and discussions. Consultants to this group will be such persons as psychologists or psycholinguists, child development specialists, specialists in children's literature or creative dramatics, story tellers, and the like.

Staff members needed for demonstration will be one or more teachers, the number depending upon the number of children's groups. These teachers should be excellent classroom teachers or specialists in working with children and writing. Part-time staff for demonstration will possibly be such persons as the good story teller, the teacher of creative dramatics, the puppeteer. A television technician to video-tape the children's writing sessions would be desirable.

## Appendix A: A Second Suggestion: Leslie Whipp:

[Mr. Whipp participated in the conference as an observer; his proposal grew out of his involvement with the group discussions and is included for its possible usefulness in developing future courses.]

This appendix concerning a course in composition for elementary teachers, which might be a segment of a six or eight weeks' language arts institute, is in effect wishful thinking on the possibility of making up the kind of course which I would like eventually to be able to present to elementary teachers. What would be the purpose of such a course? What should be the kinds of questions which it asks (and the sources of information it draws upon to answer those questions)? These are the two broad questions I want to consider here.

*Ideally*, the purpose of the course would be to help the teacher grow as a writer, teacher, and scholar. On the teacher's growth as a writer, there is little to say at this point except that this would be a secondary aim of the course, and one to be served rather implicitly than explicitly. The improvement sought may be only improvement in the understanding of what is involved in writing, or improvement in overcoming the inhibitions of fear and hostility with which a teacher tends to approach situations in which he has to write. There is no reason, so far as I know, to believe that in six or eight weeks one can bring about any marked change in how well adults do in fact write, nor does it seem necessary that the competence of the teacher as a writer implies anything about his competence as a teacher of writing.

Concerning the teacher as teacher, there is comparatively a bit more to say. *Ideally*, the composition course would equip the elementary teacher to do four things:

A. take a descriptive approach to problems of writing
B. use printed models
C. use the discovery method
D. solve "the problem of the match"

### A. A Descriptive Approach:

To speak here of taking a descriptive approach to problems of composition is obviously to ride a horse which died on linguists some time ago. But it is a serviceable beast in this context. Teachers still interpret statements about rhetoric--effective or ineffective sentence structure, punctuation, paragraph structure--as deriving their force from tradition and authority. They understand and teach children to understand that a question about writing is a question one asks of the teacher or of the handbook of rules. Yet anyone who compares what writers of a given mode who publish in a given place do with what he had long assumed from reading student papers cannot but be struck by the differences between what he finds practiced and what he formerly preached. It seems likely that meaningful questions about writing are questions which one can phrase as, "How does big daddy do this?"--that is, as questions to be referred to appropriate models.

B. Printed Models:

The concern for description has led to the second concern: that the teacher be encouraged to use printed models. It is at this point that the composition program connects in the primary classroom both with the literature program and with instruction in other disciplines. There are many implications here which I choose to ignore. One chief problem, that of how to choose and use models, receives rather fuller treatment below. Whatever the unanticipated problems, I am pushed to endorsing this practice of using models by three considerations. First, it seems clear that one learns his native language by observing and imitating more mature speakers around him (Ruth Hirsch Weir, *Language in the Crib*. Second, in the discussions at this conference the group concerned with literature has concluded that "literature ought to be the core of all language arts instruction in the elementary school" (Hedges, position paper). Third, Donald Rasmussen has observed that "encoding /writing and speaking/ is more difficult than decoding /reading and listening/." It thus seems likely that we should make learning in writing dependent upon ability in reading.

C. The Discovery Method:

The way in which models might be used may be suggested by the observation of Professor J. McVicker Hunt; as he indicates, what is now called "the discovery method" is epitomized in Socrates' discourse with the slave-boy. This method is probably the most advantageous approach to the teaching of "logic and language" and, perhaps, of their relationship to composition, to children who possess the concrete operations but have not yet acquired the formal operations of thought: that is (normally), children from 5, 6 or 7 to 12, 13 or 14. How this method works in seizing on logical models or analogies is suggested by Professor Hunt's discussion of Plato's *Meno*:

> The classic example of guiding learning appears in Plato's *Meno.* There Plato has Socrates argue that "seeking and learning are in fact nothing but recollection." Plato's aim is to get support for his theory

> of the independent existence and external reality of conceptual constructs. Socrates leads one of Meno's slave-boys to accept the principle that the square of a diagonal, or hypotenuse, is a sum of the squares of the opposite sides, merely by asking the boy questions. But Socrates is a bit sneaky: he leads the boy to make assertions and then confronts him with the discrepancy between the assertions and drawings of squares. Moreover, it is Socrates, not the boy, who suggests that each square is cut in half by its diagonal. To drive home his argument that learning is nothing but recollection, Socrates remarks (Meno, 85d) that "at present these opinions, being newly aroused, have a dream-like quality. But if the same questions are put to him on many occasions in different ways, you can see that in the end he will have a knowledge on the subject as accurate as anybody's." Actually, Socrates has forced the slave-boy, little by little, to accept a conception. By repeatedly confronting the boy with evidence dissonant with his previously-accepted conceptions, Socrates forces him to develop--perhaps even to create--a new concept. In many ways, this episode might be considered a nice demonstration of Skinner's behavior--shaping, but this would neglect the fact that the behavior of the slave-boy changed little: he was simply induced to say "yes" and "no" by utilizing his arithmetic skill in response to Socrates' questions and to the nature of the square as it is pointed out by Socrates. It is this series of inputs which both interested and perplexed the lad and which forced a modification in his conceptual structure. Moreover, in spite of his theory of recollection, Plato shows here a recognition of the phenomenon which Harlow (1949) has called the "learning set," for it is only after the same questions are put to the slave-boy on many occasions in different ways that Plato expects him to have full and accurate knowledge of the principle. (J. McV. Hunt, unpublished manuscript.)

In looking at the conceptual and rhetorical content of printed pieces from which the child might learn, this kind of questioning method may be helpful.

## D. The Match:

Finally, the institute course in composition should seek to make the elementary teacher as teacher more cognizant of and comfortable with what Professor Hunt has called "the problem of the match." Thus it should seek to enable the teacher to design writing exercises based upon an awareness of the stages in the development of children's perceptual, logical, and syntactic skills, exercises designed to utilize previously developed skills and to facilitate the development of additional skills.

I propose then four general approaches to benefit the teacher as teacher--equipping him to use a descriptive approach, to use literary models, to use the discovery method of presentation, and to solve the problem of the match. The teacher can make an effort to do these things, however, only if he has a body of information upon which to draw in order to do them.

There are several ways of slicing the body of information with which the composition course should concern itself, and the following list is only one of these. But this list does seek to include all of the topics which in one way or another should concern planners of the composition course:

1. Subject matter treated in composition.
2. Purposes or uses of the language.
3. Assumptions made about and signals directed to the audience.
4. Responses (and signals) wanted from the audience.
5. Kinds of questions asked on these subjects.
6. Sources of answers on these subjects.
7. Command of syntactic structures (form/use).
8. Intonation or punctuation.
9. Pronunciation or spelling.
10. Usage.
11. Diction.
12. Levels and kinds of organization above the level of the sentence.

The course should equip the teacher to speak descriptively, and (using literary models, and solving the problem of the match) guide the students' discovery and acquisition of each of these aspects of language. But these aspects of language are more properly less aspects of language per se than aspects of a series of "dialects" or "genres." None of them occurs as an aspect of language outside of its use in a particular context or genre, whether it is a genre of oral discursive language, of oral imaginative language, of discursive writing or of imaginative writing. It is clearly the case that there are many ways in which an understanding of one of these aspects of language (say terminal punctuation) in one genre applies to other genres. It is the case, however, that these aspects of language are handled differently in different genres (say the conventions of paragraphing). In short, the course should equip the teacher to speak not of "composition," not of "writing," but of the conventions of particular genres.

What will be the organization and content, the approaches and techniques used in a composition course which will do these things? To consider first the organization and content: the traditional Aristotelian organization still seems serviceable: invention, arrangement and style. But the matters treated in each of these sections need not be traditional: contemporary scholarship in psychology, linguistics, discourse analysis and psycholinguistics should supplement and, at times, replace more traditional information.

## Invention:

Questions of invention--what to talk about and what to say about what one talks about--vary. The Aristotelian topics are appropriate for some kinds of adult discourse, but that is as much as one can say with certainty. It seems likely that the better place to begin to treat the topic of invention is with the psychology of children. One needs to answer such questions as these: What are the stages (if they are that) in the development of the child's perceptual apparatus? What kinds of things does he notice? What kinds of things which he notices can he manifest in speech? What kinds of things which he notices can he manifest in writing? And what are the stages in the development of the child's logical apparatus? What kinds of logical operations do youngsters perform on the data they take in? When do they manifest these in speech as well as in other kinds of behavior? When do they handle them in writing?

Ideally, these questions should treat the psychological development of the child in both the pre- and post-primary years, first, to equip the teacher to build on the skills the students bring to the classroom and to point the student toward perceptual and logical skills to be developed later.[1] A sense of the child's psychological development is useful, if it is coordinated with a sense of the perceptual and logical skills called upon by different modes of discourse. Thus the second body of information one should treat in considering invention should be drawn from contemporary discourse analysis. What genres are there in children's literature? In adult literature? What perceptual and logical skills do they call into play for a listener? a reader? a writer? What can serve as models for children to use in selecting subjects and kinds of things to say about them?

---

[1] To make what I have mentioned above meaningful, this report should comment upon the available scholarship and texts in this area, but time and the resources of the conference do not permit this.

Discourse analysis should get at two other related subjects as well: first, the job the language is intended to do; second, the audience for which the job is done. Concerning the job to be done, one wants to give the teacher an awareness of the total behavior of which the language is a part--whether the language is a joke among friends or an explanation of the location of a constellation. This implies considering the nature of (first) the audience, (second) the formal devices by which the speaker or writer directly involves the audience, and (third) the audience responses which would go along with a successful use of language for the job of the respective forms.

## Arrangement:

Here we can again draw upon the fields of psychology and discourse analysis, but here the sequences can be reversed. What are strategies of organization (and their signals) for the various modes? This is the question which we must ask before we can attempt to lead students to a mastery of organization: we have to know what the strategies of organization are before we try to teach the student to master them. When they have been described, we can ask, of the psychologist, what overall forms of organization children perceive at what ages. What smaller formal sections do children perceive at what ages? What distinctions are there between the manifestation of such perception in non-verbal behavior and parallel manifestations in speech or in writing?

In addition to drawing upon the scholarship of psychologists and discourse analysts, one should also draw here upon the knowledge of the linguist and the psycholinguist. Part of the difficulty in composition comes from not giving the writer the syntax according to which he can say appropriate kinds of things. That is, we cannot assume that the syntax of discursive writing is the syntax of imaginative writing; we cannot assume that the syntax the child understands and commands as a speaker is the syntax he needs to command as a writer. Thus, the linguist can be useful to us here as providing a way of equipping the teacher to look for distinctions in the syntax of different modes. And the psycholinguist can help us learn the stages of the development of the child's syntactic apparatus as a listener, speaker, reader and writer.

It may be that one needs to give some attention at this point to the development of vocabulary, insofar as it may be useful to facilitate and manifest the student's development of his perceptual, or perhaps, logical and perceptual skills.

## Style or Elocution:

Much that has traditionally been spoken of as style, fairly clearly, has already been considered under invention and disposition, since much of style is a function of what one has to say, how one comes to say it, and who one comes to say it for. Yet there are aspects of both oral and written composition which have not yet been considered:

Intonation or punctuation
Pronunciation or spelling
Usage
Diction

These are largely what is spoken of as "mechanics" and have long usurped the place of the teaching of composition. While they probably should be greatly de-emphasized in the elementary classroom, they probably need to be dealt with at some length in the institute classroom. Fortunately, we can call upon the linguist to explain these problems and to define attitudes toward them.

# TEACHERS, CHILDREN, AND CRITICISM

Bruce Mickleburgh
Educational Courier
Toronto, Canada

Let us start with a puppet show, in kindergarten or grade 1: the 400-year-old classic, Punch and Judy. That lovable criminal, Mr. Punch, in turn disposes of Judy, the baby, Toby, and the doctor. He knocks the head right off Scaramouche. Round and round the puppet stage he capers, rooty-toot-tooting, celebrating his victory, unable to see that a dreadful figure rises up behind him: the alligator. But the children see the alligator, and they get an intimation of the nemesis that awaits their favorite villain. The alligator hisses and withdraws. Punch, suffering from an extreme dose of--is it hubris?--is gleefully oblivious of the monster. He annihilates the policeman and the hangman in turn. Then behind him rises the devil. The children see the devil. Punch does not. The children shriek their warnings: "Look out Punch! Punch! Punch! Look out!" Punch turns this way, that way, slowly, quickly--but the devil turns with him. All this while the children see something of dreadful consequence to which the central character is blind. Finally, the devil pops up in front of Punch, pins him to the wall and cries, "BOOH!!!! I HAVE COME FOR YOU!!!" But Punch outwits even the Devil. His triumph seems complete. He is invincible. It is at this moment that the alligator (who has been in the children's consciousness all the time, yet not, they know, in Punch's consciousness) returns and puts a catastrophic end to Punch's infamous career by devouring him.

Presumably any teacher can learn to operate a puppet show. But this is the easiest part, after all. The teacher who is a competent literary critic will know that whether or not she introduces the child in these early years to the actual term, irony (and the use of it may not be far-fetched as it sounds), irony is one of the elements of the child's learning with Punch and Judy.

The teacher who is a competent critic knows that the pupils are experiencing something that has the same flavour as what they will later experience if they read Sarah Cleghorn's "The Golf Links":

> The golf links lie so near the mill
> That almost every day
> The labouring children can look out
> And see the men at play

(though here we have a different kind of irony, and the teacher will know that, too). Punch suffered his peripeteia if not his anagnorisis (that was left to the children). The teacher will know that what is happening in the children's minds is laying a basis for Banquo's ghost, and that Punch's words from the alligator's belly ('So ends our play, So ends my tune') relate distantly, primitively but definitely, to Macbeth's "I have lived long enough."

The quick discussion in class of what the children knew and could see that Punch did not know and could not see might be the element that transforms the children's literary experience from a delightful but casual experience to one which relates to the inexhaustible mines of dramatic irony in the Bible, which we could consider summed up by The Preacher in Ecclesiastes 10:8-9:

> He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it, and whoso breaketh an hedge, a serpent shall bite him.
>
> Whoso removeth stones shall be hurt therewith; and he that cleaveth wood shall be endangered thereby.

I have chosen the difficult example of irony to illustrate that the teacher who is a competent critic will know exactly where a given work under study by the children fits into the whole body of literature. He will be able to relate it in his own mind so that he can structure the child's learning experience in accordance with the discipline of literary criticism.

This, clearly, is a demanding role. Few of us would care to have our car engines tuned up by a chimpanzee, but something worse than that happens when the education of the child's imagination is entrusted to the unlettered.

To be strictly accurate, we must state that neither the child nor the teacher can study literature. What is experienced is literature, but what is studied, and what is practised by the teacher in the classroom, is criticism. In fact, the bulk of all literary criticism is today practised in the classroom. The elementary school teachers form the most numerous battalions of the army of critics (at the core of which, as a kind of general staff, are the scholars). It is not unkind, in surveying these battalions, to recall (in a bowdlerized version) the words of the Duke of Wellington as he inspected his troops on the morning of Waterloo: "I don't know what they will do to the enemy, but they scare the wits out of me."

Let us take it as given that criticism is a discipline with its own field of inquiry and its own methods of inquiry which are determined by its subject matter. The teacher practising criticism in the classroom must have a knowledge of the principal body of English literature. By participating in inquiry with scholars who are extending the frontiers of criticism, he must have become competent in his critical approach.

It is the resultant creativity and disciplining that fits the teacher to practise criticism in the classroom. Anything else is secondary.

This should dispose of the sentimental, anti - professional "inspirational" approach to preparing teachers to teach literature. Northrop Frye has authorized it for us: "What inspires a good teacher is a clarified view of his own subject."[1]

By now, these remarks may have caused a spectre to rise in some minds more terrible than Punch's devil and alligator combined: that most unutterable of all conceptions, the subject teacher in the elementary school.

Yes, that is indeed what is involved. I think I realize what the present situation is and what Gibraltars may have to be stormed in some localities before the subject teacher takes his honoured place as the educator of small children. Lest you apprehend that all these remarks are going to be hopelessly impracticable, let me promise you that I will conclude with a proposal for an institute operable in 1966. To arrive at immediately practicable proposals, though (and to douse any temptation to rest content with what we can now improvise), I must first develop the conception of what is required of the critic in the classroom. The entire curriculum reform movement in the elementary schools is not going to be able to make further decisive progress without the entry into the classrooms of teachers who are masters of what they teach.

I hold with Bruner that if a subject is theoretically coherent it can be reduced to principles which can be taught to the youngest child--but the demands this makes on the teacher are extraordinary by today's standards. If the elementary teacher could meet his pupil's demands in all subjects, he would be the last of the Great Encyclopedists. I assume that we are all familiar with the conception of the spiral curriculum as developed by Bruner for our time (it is really older than Plato). Not too much is known yet about the structuring of literary criticism in the elementary classroom. There is a lot of raw experience to be gathered and digested. (My subsequent proposal for an institute will incorporate the idea of a workshop.)

But it should be clear to all of us that the child's literary experiences will only be structured with competence by one who has mastered at least the rudiments of the discipline of literary criticism. By this I do not mean a person has mastered a certain rhetoric of conclusions to regurgitate on examinations, but one who has learned to think as a critic.

---

[1] "Design for Learning" (original mimeographed report), page VII.

Need we be detained by the illusion that the critic--in the classroom or anywhere else--is one who merely grades literature? The following description of the true role of the critic applies fully to the critic in the grade 1 classroom:

> The critic's function is to interpret every work of literature in the light of all the literature he knows, to keep constantly struggling to understand what literature as a whole is about. Literature as a whole is not an aggregate of exhibits with red and blue ribbons attached to them, like a cat-show, but the range of articulate human imagination as it extends from the height of imaginative heaven to the depth of imaginative hell. Literature is a human apocalypse, man's revelation to man, and criticism is not a body of adjudications, but the awareness of that revelation, the last judgment of mankind.[2]

The teacher of literature to children should therefore have an honours degree in English, or a very good major. The university courses I would consider requisite include the following:

FIRST GROUP

This comprises the core of the programme, as follows:

a. A comprehensive survey course in English literature.

b. Courses in Biblic literature, Anglo-Saxon including Beowulf, Chaucer and other Middle English writers, Shakespeare, Milton.

c. A series of options covering the development of literature from Defoe's time to the present day.

d. Contemporary literature.

e. "United States" literature.

SECOND GROUP

To place the study of literary criticism in its proper context, the student should acquire some mastery of a modern language, of one of the other subjects than literature which are also built out of words (such as history or philosophy or one of the social sciences), and a knowledge of one or more of the arts other than literature (a survey course in the fine arts might do).

---

[2] Frye, Northrop, The Educated Imagination, Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, p. 44.

THIRD GROUP

This comprises studies which, though ancillary to the above, would be exceptionally valuable in the special education of the teacher of literature to children:

a. Of particular importance, a course in the Greek and Roman classics. If this can be accompanied by a study of Greek and Latin so much the better; (I can dream).

b. A course in creative writing.

c. A study in the myths of the original inhabitants of the area where the teacher will teach.

d. Studies in the myths and folk literature of Black Africa and Black America.

e. A sociological study of the mass media.

f. One or more courses in children's literature.

You will notice I placed the study of children's literature last. This is not because it is not of very great help to the teacher, but because the teacher is best equipped to study this field on the basis of an overall view of English literature. This will provide the basis for a critical, rather than a sentimental, approach to the study of children's literature, and make the study potent. There are certain presumably obvious dangers in doing things the other way round.

I have produced a dream teacher. Perhaps this is a dream that has already, here and there, begun to come true. Certainly it is a dream that is going to have come true on an early tomorrow if the teaching of literature is going to be transformed at the base of a child's learning experiences in school where the transformation has optimum effect. (The "Critical Years Hypothesis" is now well enough substantiated.) But what can you do in a six-week institute?

To answer that question I have two points to make. One concerns the conception of the teacher who will attend. The other concerns the conception of what they will teach. Out of these two conceptions I will draw a conception of an institute as a workshop. First, consider the teacher who will attend. He may carry his birthmark of a kind of teacher training which did not require him to be the master of any subject. Even so, if we consider him merely as a technician who will regurgitate pre-fabricated criticism, we are beat before we start.

The experience with mathematics illustrates the point, for the transformation we seek in literature is comparable to that sought in mathematics (and at least as necessary). In those classrooms where there is a revolution in mathematics it is a revolution that began inside the head of the teacher. That teacher began to think as a mathematician should think. There are other classrooms where there is the appearance of a mathematics programme, but the product is spurious.

I have experience with teachers who have sweated through six-week summer courses and followed them up with winter-long in-service courses, but who still cannot guide a class to discover by algebra the way to multiply fractions. They end up, despite a collection of pretenses to themselves and others, with the old seemingly simple method of telling the children that you multiply the two numerators together and multiply the two denominators together and you get your product. It works, doesn't it? Anyway, it seems to work--but no mathematics has been mastered. Worse, damage may have been done to the child's mind. With all credit to those who try, and with full recognition that most difficult transformations are imperfectly wrought, it must be said that a major responsibility for these weaknesses where they exist rests with those who tended to ignore teaching mathematics to teachers. They placed the emphasis on telling teachers what to teach to children and how to teach it. As one antidote to this malady, the magazine I edit has been able to publish a long series of brilliant study articles by a mathematician explaining the mathematical theory underlying what the teacher is required to teach. This is not mathematics for children, not how to teach mathematics; it is mathematics for teachers.

Perhaps the experience allows us to add a corollary to Bruner: If a subject is theoretically coherent it can be reduced to principles which can be taught to any teacher. (This, by the way, may be harder than teaching these principles to a child who does not have to unlearn what a teacher might have to unlearn.)

The point may be more visible in a subject like mathematics but the pitfalls in literature are every bit as deadly--perhaps more deadly because less obvious in a subject where a welter of subjective value-judgments has often taken the place of criticism. The point is that the main problem of the institute is how to create a revolution in the thinking of the teacher so that he may start to practise criticism in the classroom. (This requires confidence in the intellectual and philosophical abilities of the teacher. This observation is inserted for a good reason.)

Now let us consider what the teacher will teach. I have said that not too much is known yet about structuring the literary experiences of the child. Frye has pointed out that this is chiefly due to some confusion in contemporary critical theory.

In fact, he develops the argument that "the problems of literary criticism and literary education are inseparable."[3] In the same passage he mentions his search over the years for "the co-ordinating principles that would make it possible for a student of literature to be trained in criticism as well as in scholarship."

It is not possible in this paper to even summarize, let alone argue, the results of that quest. To state its direction, though, is to indicate its exceptional importance as an approach to be considered in preparing the education of teachers to teach literature to children. Forgive me for quoting again; Frye refers to the growing body of knowledge about literature and says:

> . . . it is this body of knowledge which constitutes criticism as such, and not the direct experience of literature. It is knowledge that connects one experience with another, corrects false impressions and inadequacies, and makes possible that progression and sequence in experience without which there could be no such thing as criticism . . . . The presence of criticism as a body of knowledge democratizes literature: it provides for literature an educational discipline, something that can be taught and learned; it makes literature accessible to any student with good will, and prevents it from stagnating among groups of mutually unintelligible elites.
>
> This structure of knowledge is all the more essential in criticism, because direct experience, and the intuitions of value it brings, cannot be directly communicated. The kind of 'dialogue,' as it is now fashionable to call it, that can be established between teacher and student on a basis of experience and value-judgment alone is not helpful.[4]

In keeping with his studies of structure and his work with the Ontario Curriculum Institute and other groups, Frye has evolved a theory of what should be taught to children. At the risk of over-simplification, I will attempt to summarize one or two of the basic points which offer a plausible frame of reference for the work of an institute:

---

[3] Northrop Frye, The Well-Tempered Critic, Bloomington: Indiana Indiana University Press, 1963, p. 15.

[4] The Well Tempered Critic, pp. 134-135.

1. The study of the Bible as literature should be taught early and taught thoroughly. (I personally would say, from the beginning of the child's school experience.) This first point is the most difficult point since people often get it confused with religious instruction, which is something completely different. What is meant, from a critical standpoint, is the study of the Bible as the full statement of the great controlling myth of our literature, of man's loss of innocence, of his loss of identity with nature, and his hope of recovering that state. It is the total shape of the work that is important. This grasp, this sure foundation for all subsequent study of literature, is not acquired in a day. I believe the Bible as literature has to be studied for many years.

That this study is a key to understanding an unnumbered host of allusions that saturate our literature would alone justify it. So would the monumental effect on the child's language development of assimilating the classical writing of the King James Version.

But the principal reason for the study is that the informing myth of the Bible embraces all human experience, and as such its study forms a chief and indispensable foundation for future studies.

(In my opinion it is only when we start to examine this kind of proposition that we start to leave the realm of a casual or random approach and enter the realm of structure.)

2. This should be followed by a teaching of the classics of Greek and Roman mythology and romance (which are more fragmentary than the Bible but more explicit in their statement of the role of the hero).

On these first two points stand all the others, for myth is a structural principle of story-telling. (From my experience I would add to this the teaching of principal myths and epics of other peoples, including those indigenous to our own localities.)

3. All the poetry that can be got into the classroom hours should be taught, with particular attention to the physical experience of the rhythm. Poetry, the most natural form of speech, is at the heart of literature. We work outwards from it to prose.

4. Romance and comedy are more suitable for children in the elementary school than irony and tragedy. (I personally would add a caution against interpreting this too mechanically.)

5. The pupil has to be taught the art of listening to the story as a whole. This is basic training for the imagination. There are many people who as long as they live never grasp the distinction between imaginative and discursive writing. Looking for the moral (a form of

literary sabotage practised in classrooms without number) has to be replaced by reacting to the structure. Accompanying learning to listen to stories is learning to write them.

Here is an elemental basis for a new attack in the classroom, and for a working programme for an institute. I personally am inclined to think it is the basis for the same type of transformation in literature which has occurred in mathematics. Whether this would be agreed or not, I hope it might be agreed that it is sufficiently promising to put it to the test. I submit that whatever programme is evolved is experimental at this stage.

I have considered above (1) what is in the mind of the teacher and (2) what he should be required to teach. From these dual considerations springs the conception of an institute which will be a workshop and seminar. Taking part should be pupils, teachers, education specialists, specialists in children's literature, and advanced critics and scholars.

The mode of the workshop would be that of an exploration taken together, testing in practice the structuring of the literary experiences of children--and testing critical principles against that classroom experience. The advanced critics will gain new insights. The teachers will learn more from being taken into full partnership in this enterprise than they could in any other way.

Here is a scheme of components of such an institute:

1. Working teams of teachers, specialists and critics prepare lessons. The teacher as the practitioner does the actual preparation. The others are consultants. The teacher teaches the lesson. The institute then convenes a discussion session to evaluate the lesson, and to hear a thorough critical presentation and discussion on the next day's lesson topic. It would be good for the specialists and critics to take part in the teaching, either through a team teaching approach or other methods, but the main brunt of the practice teaching should be borne by classroom teachers. The practice is primarily (though not only) for them.

Lessons to be taught should include:

a. Bible stories: e.g., Moses found in the bulrushes, the deliverance of the Israelites, Joseph's coat of many colours, Jonah and the whale, David and Goliath, the nativity stories, Daniel and the lion, Shadrach, Meshak and Abednego, the child Jesus, and so on.

b. Greek myths and epics. Here interesting comparisons can be made between lessons based on Hawthorne's Wonder Book, Kingsley's Heroes, Padraic Colum's Golden Fleece and Bullfinch's Book of Myths.

c. It would be useful to go further with epic. Beowulf in Sutcliff's version and By His Own Might by Hosford offer a basis for comparison. Such other epics as the Norse Sigurd might be considered too.

d. There should be a lesson or two based on myths and legends of the original local inhabitants.

In all of the above lessons, as well as those that follow, emphasis should be placed on grasping the mythic structure and central archetypes of literature. Basic critical principles are involved. To those who might think this indicates bias in favour of a particular critical school I can only plead for recognition that at least the principles involved are of particular value in criticism for children.

Here is the second series of lessons that should be taught:

e. A series of many lessons on poetry ranging from Mother Goose through A Child's Garden of Verses and others. (Untermeyer's anthology is an arsenal, though somewhat one-sided.)

f. A series based on the introduction of such classics as a committee might decide illustrate main points under exmination in the institute, classics such as Pinnochio, Winnie the Pooh, Andersen's fairy tales, or Tom Sawyer.

The preparation and evaluation of lessons taught to young pupils will fructify the institute's studies for teachers and academics alike. (For the academics the institute would become in part a laboratory for the testing of critical principles.)

2. A survey course on literary criticism, occupying a daily hour of class time, plus assignments. Included would be such elements as some theories of criticism, elements of fiction, point of view, allegory and symbolism, style, narrative and lyric poetry, figurative language with all that is entailed under this heading, romance, irony, comedy, tragedy, elements of drama, and a special lecture in an extended session on archetypes. To be severely practical I suggest a text which covers the field (except on archetypes) with a competence few could criticize: An Introduction to Literature, by Barnet, Berman and Burto.

3. Perhaps most important, a daily seminar designed to give the teacher a much more profound theoretical basis and motivation for embarking on the continuing study and practice of literary criticism.

Everybody here will recognize what a great, big, fat illusion it would be to imagine that a six-week institute can manufacture a teacher fully competent to teach literature. But if we were not careful we could provide a new illustration of the old saying that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

The essential victory of the institute must be to enable the teacher to achieve a revolution in his own conceptions of literature, of literature's role in society, and of his own role as critic. The birth of this new outlook can be as painful and difficult as any other birth, and the triumph as joyful. I propose the seminar as the theatre of this transformation.

Once the teacher understands how and why literature constantly constructs a vision of what our world can be (as opposed to what it is); once he understands how literature fosters the ability to distinguish between illusion and reality; once he understands how mob rule threatens us if the automatic gabble we hear on all sides becomes the predominant language of society; once he understands how literature rescues us from this fate, the fate of men who build a tower of Babel; once he has estimated what part criticism has to play in creating not merely an affluent but a civilized society; once he has had a considered view of the reliance man has placed in literature in each of the stages of his long quest for Paradise; once he has glimpsed the sweep of evolution of the forms of literature and the needs of man that these forms together meet; once he has discovered that the common language of man is the language of literature; once he has understood his role in determining whether the child has an ill-trained or a well-educated imagination; once a series of such root revelations have exploded inside his mind--then the institute has started a process which cannot be stopped.

The teacher will set his foot on the path of the critic. To the end of his teaching days he may want to deepen his own education, to strive for mastery of the whole body of literature so that he may relate his pupils' experiences to it.

As he subsequently studies, so will he teach. As has happened in mathematics, teachers and pupils will be learning simultaneously and often together. Nothing to be sorry about in that.

If again I recommend a book it is not this time out of a desire to be severely practical. It is because I know of no other work designed precisely to bring about understandings of the order of those I have mentioned.

The book is a slender paper-back, The Educated Imagination. Its six chapters were originally six lectures by Northrop Frye on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio network. Each chapter offers the basis for a week's discussions in the seminar I have proposed for the institute.

I am not apologizing for proposing this specific book because it is essentially a compact fusion of what man now knows about literature with a fundamental consideration of how to teach it.

This makes it one of the decade's summit works on education. Fortunate will be the teachers who can grapple with it in seminar.

Such is my proposal for an institute which should find out more than we know about "teaching literature." It should itself make discoveries in the process of teachers learning the theory and classroom practice of criticism. In such an institute, pupils, teachers and academics engage in a joint search for solutions to problems we have only begun delineate.

* * * * *

I cannot leave this argument of The Educated Imagination without noting that the precision of the latter's 68 pages is motivated by the passion we require to accomplish a literary renaissance in the classroom.

I did say, "Renaissance," and I did choose the word with care. Reflect only that three elementary school pupils were saturated with the Bible and the Classics: Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton.

I did say "passion" and I tried to use the word precisely in at least one of its senses. For we are passionate humanists who seek this renaissance.

But lest I be misunderstood, let me return to a point made at the outset: "What inspires a good teacher is a clarified view of his own subject."

Perhaps nowhere more than on this continent do men need more to hear what the imagination can tell them if they allow it to be educated by the literature created not by men here or men there but by Man. And that is not alone an academic question.

# INSTITUTES IN LITERATURE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

The following proposals assume an institute devoted primarily to literature, considering literature as the core of language arts instruction in the elementary school.

## Outline Proposals for Summer Institutes from the Literature Committee

I. Section on preliminaries

A. The audience

We identified four kinds of institute participants and it is our wish that the proposals presented here be adaptable with some modification to all four. We felt, however, that it was necessary to keep in mind the largest audience, which, with individual modifications from institutions, is the likely one that most institutes will be directed towards. We were especially mindful, then, in developing these proposals, of those teachers who had had little or no formal experience with literature other than two semesters of Freshman English, a course of a very general sort in literature, some work in related areas like composition and reading, and a course in children's literature.

1. The group of teachers who have had little or no experience in literature.

2. The group of teachers with some or perhaps a considerable amount of training in conventional programs of literature for secondary or general A. B. majors.

3. The person who might have the kind of background that is indicated under (2) but who would in any event have been trained to use the lecture-discussion approach and would need retraining for teaching literature in the elementary school.

4. This general rubric includes special kinds of teacher-related persons such as elementary supervisors, teachers of deprived children, college teachers who need special training in order to become teachers of institutes, and teachers of children's literature to teachers in institutes.

a. We feel that it is necessary at this point to indicate clearly that there is a need first of all for specialized institutes in various phases of English especially emphasizing literature for supervisors and teachers of the deprived so that deprived children may gain a firm footing in the great tradition.

b. The second group that we discerned (elementary teachers and persons with special competencies in the elementary were most emphatic here) are college teachers of teachers in institutes and college teachers of children's literature who need special work in a variety of areas not necessarily covered in detail in the subsequent suggestions in this document.

B. Some general suggestions about preliminary programs needs.

1. A definition of children's literature needs to be clearly in mind at the outset of any program planning (Appendix A, statement of Virginia Reid).

a. The experience of literature
The committee was anxious to make it clear that what is experienced in the kind of programs envisioned here is literature, that is, literary works themselves. What is studied is literary criticism.

b. Literary criticism
The committee is agreed that through literary criticism one gets at the experiencing of literature and makes it illuminating by various means that are a part of the general subject of literary criticism in its more practical applications.

c. "Instruct and delight"
The committee adapted this well-worn phrase from Mickleburgh's talk in order to remind ourselves and others that literature can instruct in the nature of experience--we are not speaking of instruction in a moralistic sense--and an aspect of this instruction is the delight of discovery, the shock of recognition, the discernment of one's self in relationship to other selves.

2. "Methods" (See discussion by Eileen Tway in Appendix B).

3. The role of the arts of picture, dance, music, and especially the illustrated book (see discussion by Doris Kuhn in Appendix C).
The committee felt very strongly that to talk of literature without a continual relationship of it to other art forms was

to talk in a vacuum. We wish to emphasize at this point (in the kinds of paradigms we are developing there is no other place for such emphasis) that any discussion of literature which does not involve some or many of the other arts and does not provide a plastic experience with the arts is likely to be considerably less than a successful experience with literature.

4. The committee wished to emphasize the need for a specific and well-defined curriculum in literature in the elementary school. It was the general feeling that too often literature is the last thing one does in the elementary classroom and that unless the literature program, no matter how brief or how long, is carefully organized into a variety of sequential experiences throughout the elementary years the encounter is likely to be an insignificant one.

C. The library and the elementary school literary program (see discussion by Mark Taylor in Appendix D).

1. We have already referred to the definition of children's literature as worked out in some detail in Virginia Reid's appendix to this document. Here we wish to emphasize that literature for children is that good literature written by authors with highly developed esthetic skills. Children's literature is not only literature written specifically for children, then, but also general literature which is adaptable to the special interests of children, in part or in whole.

2. Keeping up with new books.

a. The task of keeping up with new books is probably beyond even the most assiduous elementary teacher, who will have enough to do to keep herself well acquainted with the older books for children.

b. A corollary is that the person whose professional responsibility it is to keep up with new books is the librarian, and elementary teachers need to develop close relationships with librarians and need to have librarians in larger elementary schools to keep track of interesting new books and to get them (even more important) in the libraries for their use.

3. The establishment of elementary school libraries. It was the committee's feeling that elementary school libraries should be given an extra push by institutes in various ways.

Librarians can be asked to provide lists of suitable books. Institutes can form basic collections for frequent and easy consultation of teachers, and the possibility of travelling collections might be explored for remoter areas and smaller schools.

D. Problems of physical and psychological maturation (see statement of Ned Hedges, Appendix E).

1. The names of Piaget, Hunt, and Bruner are mentioned here simply as guidepoints for the teachers to start looking from.

2. It was emphasized by Joe Hunt that there is a lack of precise knowledge as to the order of events in which literary experiences might occur to children. Since there is a lack of precise knowledge about exactly how literature should occur to children or in what order, some points need to be kept in mind.

a. A teacher should avoid any kind of rigidity in her approach to any individual in her classroom.

b. It is an old point to call teaching an "art." But perhaps the need for artfulness from the teacher may be emphasized by a full recognition of this lack of knowledge of the developmental aspects of the children's understanding or capacity for understanding literature and the modes through which literature operates such as metaphor, irony, etc.

c. The need for a demonstration class as an aspect of most institutes would seem to be more pressing than the committee first thought, as assertions of institute teachers and ideas of institute participants need immediate testing places to determine whether or not they are viable. Joe Hunt emphasized that the two determinants of some developmental growth in the mind are the evidences of interest and surprise. It was also suggested that children can be interested and surprised by variety in sensory experience: to see the puppet show of *Punch and Judy*, to read about such puppet shows, and to handle the puppets and to construct puppets. All of these experiences which can be extended in various directions limited only by the ingenuity of teachers would be helpful in enlarging the dimensions of sensory experience.

d. Finally, since the teacher must be so flexible, it suggests any teacher must be unshockable--at least in the obvious sense of that word. Hunt emphasized that pre-schoolers and kindergarten children are delighted by things that often shock adults. Teachers of disadvantaged children often speak in ways that are considered coarse or vulgar to middle-class minds. The teacher then must avoid being miminy-piminy.

E. Varying time schedules for institutes.

1. The usual institute may continue to be six or eight weeks long; however, participants in this planning committee felt that there is nothing inviolable about six to eight weeks and, indeed, many felt that more experimental patterns might be undertaken.

2. Another kind of pattern of use for an institute might be a weekly seminar conducted during the school year and accessible to selected teachers.

3. An even more intensive as well as longer approach was suggested by several planners: an institute two summers long with occasional seminars during the year might be the best way not only of getting special learning about literature started but also of observing it in practice and correcting it with a more intensive approach to special areas of need in the second summer. To the question raised as to whether or not the government would support these, the answer was given that up until now the government has not been backward about supporting any proposal that it felt was well-staffed, well-planned, and philosophically relevant.

F. Various ways of working with teachers invited to participate in institutions.
Here members of the committee, especially those who had direct experience as elementary teachers or in work with elementary teachers, felt that some very important points needed to be kept in mind.

1. There should be opportunities in any institute for self-exploration and for proper motivation since institute participants are usually experienced teachers and ought to be allowed to partake very directly in their own process of education and ought to be entrusted with some of the task and the dignity that attaches to the task.

2. Need for time. Most planning participants agreed that institutes tended to overload the time of teachers in institutes with directed activities that they were expected to participate actively in. Again and again the assertion was made that teachers simply need time to look about, and perhaps this is best summed up in the succinct phrase of one of the planners: the need for a "Thinking Thursday."

3. The "Match."
Joe Hunt emphasized that the psychological concept of the match, that is, finding that moment when a particular teacher-student is ready to learn a particular thing, is more important than any lock-step planning; and scheduling should be flexible enough so that this matching in the special sense defined here can occur at various points for various persons. Hunt also emphasized that to the extent that instruction is individualized (freer and less lock-stepped) more individuals have an opportunity to develop, and he pointed out again and again that this development can occur at any age; it is not simply a phenomenon of the development of elementary school age children but can also be observed in adults.

4. It is necessary that the institute staff respect the teacher participants as the participants do the staff. Both are partners in a noble enterprise which should be shared on an equal basis, regardless of differences in amount or kind of education or immediate concerns of that sort. One institute deliberately encouraged the use of first names between staff and participants in order to break down the barriers that tend to be created otherwise, for getting back to Hunt's ideas, it is when barriers are broken down that learning occurs at its maximum rate.

G. The teaching staff for literature institutes.

The committee felt that it wished to include a discussion of teaching staff so that certain emphases could be brought up that might otherwise be overlooked in the discussion of two kinds of institutes that follows this introduction.

1. A variety of specialists should be available as consultants, occasional teachers of seminars, and in other ways devised by the ingenuity of planners so that the institute experience should not be too limited. It was felt that specialists in literature tend to look at their discipline too narrowly; information about learning processes, brought to the planning group by a psychologist at this meeting, can perhaps

serve to emphasize some of the needs that might be mentioned here. Other specialists that might be consulted or invited to participate in various ways are librarians with special information about children's literature, and outstandingly successful classroom teachers.

2. The philosophical commitment of the teaching staff in an institute for elementary teachers is especially important. Teachers on the staff should undertake the enterprise in a spirit of great interest and of willingness to participate in all of the activities, not just on a part-time, occasional classroom basis; for just as the teachers in the institute need to participate fully so do the staff members (perhaps in this area more than in any other, literature specialists have a great deal to learn). Especially important is their observation of demonstration classes, of the development of special lessons and related matters.

## II. Institute Proposals

A. The first institute described here is conceived as a workshop designed to integrate the study of literary criticism and exploration of teaching of literary criticism. [1]

The essence of this workshop is that it is an exploration taken together. Taking part should be pupils, teachers, education specialists, specialists in children's literature, and advanced critics and scholars.

The workshop would test in practice the structuring of the literary experiences of children; teachers would experiment with the practice of criticism in the institute's classrooms with representative groups of pupils. The advanced critics working in the institute will gain new insights. The teachers will learn more from being taken into full partnership in this enterprise than they could in any other way. Together, the teachers, education specialists, specialists in children's literature and the advanced critics and scholars would form a collegium.

The morning opens with a lesson taught by a teacher to a class (eight pupils would be about the right number for the class).

---

[1] This is essentially a modification of the program proposed by Mickleburgh in his position paper. Vide supra.

In launching this series of almost daily lessons, care must be devoted to creating the setting of experiment in which the teacher can work without the inhibitions that otherwise might attend teaching in a goldfish bowl. It must be completely clear from the outset that these are not demonstration lessons but experimental lessons. The teachers who make a mistake, including the teachers whose lessons 'come apart,' will make at least as vital a contribution as those who manage to teach a stunning lesson. The institute's classroom is a real life classroom, not a fantasy.

After a lesson, the colleagues all meet for an evaluation session to search out the strong points and positive experience. If the teacher is self-critical or puzzled and seeks guidance over something that happened, problems of the lesson may be analyzed by any teacher, specialist or academic who has something positive to contribute. But we must remember with these professional practitioners the dictum we urge upon them to guide them in their work with children: don't crush the life out of these sensitive explorations by negative criticism. Everybody is there to help everybody else. The teacher has made the biggest contribution by teaching the lesson for the others to learn from his experience.

Following a short intermission, the collegium reconvenes to hear a presentation by an advanced critic on a piece which is to be the basis of a subsequent lesson, e.g., Vachel Lindsay's "The Moon's the North Wind's Cooky." Each piece should illustrate a point that is being made sometime during the summer in the afternoon part of the programme. In the case of this example, the critical point might be the magic of metaphor.

Following the lecture, discussion on the poem, on metaphor, on methods should be wide open. Anybody with a special contribution should make it then. This will enrich the preparation to teach that lesson by the teacher whose assignment it is, but nobody will tell him what to do.[2] He is the critic in charge for that lesson. In his preparations, he may consult individually with any member of the entire collegium, from the school librarian to the behavioural psychologist to the author of a doctoral dissertation on extended metaphor. The decision to consult is his alone. He is not be be badgered by specialists, but helped.

---

[2] Lessons to be taught should include Bible stories, Greek myths and epics, myths and legends of the original local inhabitants, many lessons on poetry and such classics as Pinocchio, Winnie the Pooh, and Andersen's Fairy Tales.

These sessions of evaluation of and preparation for lessons take care of the special discussion of literature for children. They are the bridge between the afternoon's more theoretical sessions and the practice of criticism with children. They should be a rich experience for the entire collegium, the occasion for a fruitful cross-fertilization of ideas. It will be discovered that the children themselves have offered much. This will also provide scope for illustration of learning theory with a broad spectrum of children and illustrate in practice the relevance of stages of development. Teachers choose their topics and methods in accordance with their own strengths and curiosities. The same piece might be examined by two or more teachers in different ways (e. g. , three ten-minute lessons to different groups on "The Moon's the North Wind's Cooky").

It would be good for the specialists and advanced critics to take part in the teaching, either through a team teaching approach or other methods, but the main brunt of the practice teaching should be borne by classroom teachers. The practice is primarily (though not only) for them. To achieve maximum concentration on the critical experience in the classroom, teachers should teach pupils of the same age groups and socio-economic backgrounds they normally teach.

Such a heavy load is placed on such an institute that several things always have to be accomplished simultaneously. This institute does that throughout. Tendencies to fragmentation must be shunned.

The afternoon sessions comprise two parts:

First, there is a daily one-hour lecture and discussion. This is a survey course on literary criticism with its illustrations drawn from the whole field of literature. It includes assignments. Included would be such elements as some theories of criticism, elements of fiction, point of view, allegory and symbolism, style, narrative and lyric poetry, figurative language with all that is entailed under this heading, romance, irony, comedy, tragedy, elements of drama, and a special lecture in an extended session on archetypes. (Suggested text: An Introduction to Literature, by Barnet, Berman and Burto /Little, Brown/ or any equally competent and compact equivalent.) The purpose of this course is to ensure critical literacy and communication.

Second, and crucial to the lasting and profound impact of the institute, is a daily one-hour seminar that terminates the organized day. A competent critic of the broadest inter-disciplinary range, well-schooled in philosophy and skilled in group discussion, would be the ideal person to conduct this seminar. Team-work might have to be a resort.

The purpose of the seminar is to enable the teacher to achieve a transformation in his own conceptions of literature, of literature's role in society, and of his own role as critic. The result should be that to the end of his days he strives for mastery of the whole body of literature so that he may relate his pupils' experience to it.

Suggested text as basis for discussion (five sessions to each of its six chapters): *The Educated Imagination*, by Northrop Frye (Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1964). This book was written precisely to bring about such transformations in the mind of the person not schooled as a critic. In fact, it was addressed to a lay audience. The rhetoric, content and length are exactly right. Any other book that would meet these stipulations could be used--but remember, we are dealing with philosophy too (or perhaps even *essentially*).

A further note on the seminar: since central to its discussions will be a fusion of what man now knows about criticism with the application of critical theory in the classroom, this is the place where curricular considerations should be examined. Here are five such considerations: (1) The Bible as literature should be taught early and thoroughly (this is not religion). (2) This should be followed by a teaching of the Greek and Roman classics (and perhaps some of the principal myths and epics of other peoples, including indigenous peoples). (3) All the poetry that can be got into the classroom should be taught, with particular attention to the physical experience of the rhythm. We work outwards from poetry to prose. (4) Romance and comedy are more suitable for elementary children than irony and tragedy. (5) The pupil has to be taught the art of listening to the story *as a whole*. This is basic. We don't look for the message, we react to the structure. Accompanying learning to listen to stories is learning to write them.

For the seminar discussions (as well as the course) to be tested in practice, the lesson topics should be chosen to illustrate the above considerations, as well as other facets of the seminar and course.

At the core of the institute is the interaction of theory and practice--criticism in action as exploration.

Opportunities for enrichment and independent study would be provided on one day of the week. For example, there might be participation in choral reading, creative dramatics, storytelling, poetry reading. Exploration of art in picture books might be another activity. Teachers need time to browse in the library, becoming aware of new books for children, paperbacks, films, recordings.

B. The committee also discussed an institute incorporating a basic literature course with a practicum devoted to the application of literary principles to a consideration of children's literature.

1. Course(s) and critical analysis of literature.
Any course or courses in critical analysis of literature would be focused on an examination of the principles and characteristics of a variety of genres without necessarily a concentration on "children's literature" as such. The approach of the course would be primarily critical. Although not a course in children's literature, it would select from the great body of literary conventions, patterns, and types, those conventions or genres that are most commonly used by writers for children. The course should concentrate upon the modes: parable, fable, epic (myth), comedy, and romance, including both prose and poetry. (But for one suggested structure of such a course, and for one suggestion of specific content in such a course, see "Analyzing Literature in the Elementary Institute," *Source Book on English Institutes for Elementary Teachers* [MLA, NCTE, 1965]). The methodology to be employed in this course will vary according to the instructor and the preparation of the students. The instructor may wish, for example, to investigate principal examples of each genre in order to determine the basic patterns and conventions characteristically employed in the genre. Then the investigation may move to other examples of the genre in order to reinforce the study of specific conventions, and to discover modifications and variations of the basic patterns and even perhaps to examine other examples of genre which employ quite different patterns and conventions for quite different purposes. The study may then move to a consideration of specific children's works within the same genre to discover the extent to which the children's works employ the same conventions to produce

essentially the same kind of literary meaning.[3] (For example, the instructor may wish to begin the study of epic with the *Odyssey*, then progress to the study of the *Song of Roland*, Chaucer's "Knight's Tale" and the *Faerie Queene* in order to establish the principal conventions of epic through several literary cultures, and then take up a work like *The Wind in the Willows* to investigate the use of epic conventions in a book ostensibly written for children.)

Some instructors might find it more fruitful to use with the elementary school teachers a more inductive approach to the discovery of the conventions within any particular literary genre, progressing from the simpler to the more difficult. (For example, the instructor may wish to begin with what the student already knows--in terms of the discovery of epic conventions once again, perhaps with the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, *Little Tim and the Brave Sea Captain*, *The Wind in the Willows*. He could elicit from the teachers their understanding of the basic characteristics of such books and *then* read the *Odyssey*, the *Song of Roland*, etc. Only after having produced the evidence of reading a series of works withing the epic genre would the student attempt to arrive at any generalizations concerning the conventions and patterns of the genre.)

However the organization or method of instruction may be handled in such a course, the emphasis should continue to be upon a critical analysis of the specific works included in the course.

2. Practicum

Although the course described in the preceding paragraphs and the practicum to be described in the succeeding paragraphs may be administratively separate activities, they should not be considered as two separate courses of study. The learning produced from one will necessarily inform the learning to be gained from the other. The practicum would retain essentially the same approach to literary problems but might emphasize in its detail a consideration of children's literature particularly and of the teacher as critic at work in a classroom situation. One kind of activity in the practicum would involve each student's working out of his own critical relationship to a specific work of children's literature. After the student has determined his own relationship to the work he may then attempt to discover the applications of his critical principles to the teaching of the work in a classroom.

---

[3] The intention is not reductive; one ought not examine literary works to see "how they are all alike and all say the same thing." The course might attend to the generic structure commonly used, in various cultures, for communicating literary or "mythic" meaning: to the different kinds of figurative or "eidolon" meaning produced by the use of differing symbolic or iconological "elements" (to use Thomas' phrase) in similar general generic situations.

The practicum would include a wide variety of activities--for example: demonstrations of classes in session, consideration of methods of oral interpretation, lectures by permanent and visiting consultants on special topics and problems, exhibits and practical demonstrations of audio-visual and library materials available to the elementary school teacher, etc. The practicum should especially devote some attention to the use of literature in the teaching of composition and the understanding and manipulation of linguistic patterns.

The committee would like to make some cautionary remarks about the organization and the operation of the practicum. First of all, all teachers and students in the institute should be actively engaged in both the planning and the activities of the practicum. Secondly, the practicum must be quite carefully structured; but it must be structured at any specific time with a primary concern for the immediate interests of the students and for the immediate concern of the literature class. Third, the teaching personnel of the institute should be readily available at all times to provide individual assistance to individual students.

## C. Other kinds of proposals

1. The broader institute with equal time given to composition and language or related combinations with literature.

2. The institute for college teachers of children's literature or of literature to elementary teachers.

3. The institute for elementary supervisors.

Note: The preceding proposals have assumed an institute devoted primarily to literature, considering literature as the core of language arts instruction in the elementary school. The committee on literature of this conference recognizes, however, that some institutes may be proposed that would include more than one discipline within the language arts (linguistics, rhetoric, speech, reading, literature). The preceding proposals for literature programs could be modified to form part of the concern of an institute.

The first proposal (workshop format) could perhaps be modified and treated as a condensed three-week program, constituting the entire institute activity during that three-week period. Since the literary study would demand an intensive amount of time simply for reading, such a condensation would make it necessary to ask institute participants to have read prior to the institute many, if not all, of the literary selections to be treated during the institute.

The second proposal could perhaps be modified so as to constitute the equivalent of one three-hour credit course to be taught throughout the duration of the institute. In either case, the workshop-demonstration sessions included in nearly any institute would provide sufficient opportunity for interdisciplinary combinations as they would coalesce in actual classroom practice.

To anyone with the fortitude to attempt such a comprehensive institute: When you "modify" the literature program, beware the Jabberwock and shun the frumious Bandersnatch.

## Appendix A. Virginia Reid: Children's Literature: A Definition:

It was Anatole France who said, "When you are writing for children, do not assume a style for the occasion. Think your best and write your best. Let the whole thing live."

Children's Literature is then that body of literature which "lives" for children: drama, prose and poetry in which they feel involved.

Such literature may or may not have been written for children. For example, a child may see his own experiences mirrored in poetry by reading or hearing "A Bird Came Down the Walk" by Emily Dickinson, "My Shadow" by Stevenson or "Otto" by Gwendolyn Brooks. He may be led to an understanding of symbolism and hidden meaning by Christina Rossetti's "Who Has Seen the Wind," Vachel Lindsay's "The Moon's the North Wind's Cooky," John Ciardi's "Rain Sizes" or "The River is a Piece of Sky."

The theme of being on your own against the elements can be communicated through *Robinson Crusoe* or *Island of the Blue Dolphins*. But some adult literature is not for children--*The Children's Hour* and Field's *Little Boy Blue* are two which are written about children but are not for children. By the time a child is interested in a moral, Aesop's fables qualify as children's literature.

Through planned exposure children could and should be introduced to some examples of each of the following:

Picture Books
Fables
Folk Tales
Myths and Legends
Traditional and Modern Imaginative Tales for Children
Realistic Fiction
Biography
Informational Books
Drama
Poetry

The exact titles could and should differ as each Institute plans its own series of concepts to be developed.

Emily Dickinson has said:

> A word is dead
> When it is said,
> Some say.
> I say it just
> Begins to Live
> That day--

Someone else has said that poetry was words in their best order.

Children's Literature then is that body of literature in which "words in their best order" will continue to live, to affect and enrich the children who are involved.

## Appendix B. Eileen Tway: Methods in a Literary Retraining Program

The connotation given to the term "methods courses" is such that whenever it is mentioned in our committee discussions some eyebrows are raised. As a practicing elementary teacher I can't separate methods courses and other kinds of courses. I think a course in children's literature must involve methods of presentation but I cannot see a separate course just called "methods." First, we must have a body of content in order to give the teacher background knowledge. But along with this background knowledge the teacher must have some knowledge of ways of working with children. These ways of working with children could be called methods, and from now on when I discuss methods in this paper I will be referring to the kind that are interwoven with the content of the course. By methods I don't mean a watered-down or very general course in ways of working with children which does not relate to something that is entirely being done with children.

Children can be led to discover principles of literary criticism through their own reading and writing. If a teacher knows the basic principles of literary criticism and ways to help children discover them she can capitalize on the children's on-going experiences in the classroom. For example, one class may discover principles of literary criticism through creative writing. If the ending of a shared story doesn't satisfy the class the children may begin to think about the structure of a story. Maybe they have never consciously thought about it before. But they have made a discovery now that structure is important to a story. Another class may make this same discovery when a teacher reads Stuart Little to the class. Some children feel that this ending is not satisfying, that it doesn't tell enough. They begin to think about a story's having a beginning, middle and end because the structure of this story left them with questions. They can even be led to compare it with E. B. White's Charlotte's Web in which the ending may seem over-long. Different classes may make the discovery of the same literary principle through different experiences. The teacher needs to know many possible ways of helping children to discover principles before she can develop the ways that can work for her.

In an institute here are some methods that could be used to help teachers know methods that they could use:

Where possible there could be demonstration classes of children having literary experiences; there could also be films showing the way in which a master teacher could lead children in their discoveries. Experienced teachers could be brought in to discuss ways that have worked for them. There may be current articles in professional magazines that would deal with current classroom practices that seem promising. As far as discovery goes the teachers may begin to reach back in their own experience and share with each other some good things that they remember happening.

Experience with literature should involve all the senses; certainly the writing itself in any great piece of literature will deal with all the senses. That is, the author won't just describe something visually but will let the reader know something of what is heard, felt, maybe even smelled. For children their first experience with literature will probably involve listening to stories. They will also be looking at pictures in picture books very early. In their enthusiasm they may act out the story. We shouldn't forget the importance of listening and creative dramatics in the classroom. Experiences with literature do not need to be confined to the reading of literature. This does not mean that the children need to do something extra or special every time they read a book. Reading a book can of course be satisfying in itself; that is where the teacher needs to take her cues from the children. Was there something in a book to lead the child to want to extend his experience? What I'm trying to say is that there may be something he wants to do about his reading other than just experiencing it in his imagination, but this should not be forced on him from outside. The teacher will have to be sensitive to the particular discoveries that each child is making so that she can lead the child to see relationships between the new discoveries and things he has discovered in the past.

I believe that a child should be exposed to all the best in literature, but allowed to make his own choices. Then, I do not believe that we should rule out of the classroom books that are not the best literature. Much can be learned from a critical comparison of good books with their less well-written counterparts. For example, when children who are able to read both are given an original and an adapted version of a classic, they will invariably choose the original to read. Also, children who have been helped to discover principles of literary criticism for themselves will then be able to understand better their reactions to books. When children say, "I liked this book. It was good," they will be able to explain why they thought it was good. On the other hand, when a child says, "I didn't like this book; it was boring," he will be able to explain why it was boring. This ability on the part of children to explain reactions to books will help the teacher in her picking up cues to guide her in her teaching.

One year in my own third grade class the children were quite excited about the movie "Mary Poppins" as it was coming to town; they liked the book. Seeing the movie version of a classic might be considered a questionable experience. It might prove to be a letdown in that the quality of the movie would not meet the quality of the original classic. I decided to try to turn this experience into a profitable one by using it as an opportunity for critical comparison. The children went to the movie as a group with the specific purpose in mind of comparing the movie and the book. Taste being an individual thing, the children had varying opinions, but the majority of the children preferred the book. As one child said, "My imagination is wider than that screen." But the criticism never loomed so large that it spoiled our enjoyment. We had a marvelous time! We even had a good time airing our differences of opinion. The minority opinion was certainly respected.

Teachers need to understand the importance of respecting children's opinions. In an atmosphere of acceptance and respect children will be free to express their feelings. Children have an instinctive way of knowing things about literature that would be very worthwhile for adults to take note of. Teachers should be encouraged to really listen to children. And in sum I am saying that the teacher must have a wide background of knowledge herself, but she must take her cue from the children as to how she will help them to grow in their own knowledge. And she must have a wide repertoire of methods from which to select when she responds to the cues of her children. This makes any program in literature for children a highly individualized program.

## Appendix C. Doris Kuhn: The Role of Pictures and Illustrations in Elementary Reading

The picture book (picture story book) should be included as one important element of study in the literature component of an institute. Children respond to the total image; they perceive visual and verbal symbols as a whole. In his Caldecott acceptance speech in 1965, Beni Montressor expresses the artist's view of this total experience. Teachers need to learn how to look at picture books, how artists achieve the total effect; they need to see how illustrations create mood, extend meanings, add detail, develop characterization *et cetera*. The illustrated book may also be considered. For example, students might compare illustrations of Aesop's fables by Artzybasheff and the Provensons.

A literature institute might bring artists as consultants.

Films such as *The Lively Art of Picture Books* or *Robert McCloskey* would provide a good introduction to the study of pictures.

Subsidiary study of techniques of illustration might be included. Teachers should become familiar with such terms as wood cut, water color wash, lithograph, color separation.

Issues raised by Frances Clarke Sayers in her recent article, "Walt Disney Accused," merit discussion.

## Appendix D. Mark Taylor: *The Role of Libraries and Librarians in Institutes on Elementary English Language Arts*

Whenever and wherever NDEA-sponsored institutes are offered in the five areas being considered at this conference, great care should be taken to have children's librarians (both school and public) participate in the planning sessions and in the institute themselves. Printed and audio-visual materials, specialized and general bibliographies, exhibits of books and book-related displays, provided by librarians, will enhance teacher institutes on Elementary English Language Arts. This will apply especially to institutes devoted to literature in the elementary school curriculum.

Librarians are not just custodians and dispensers of books: in selecting books for collections, providing reading guides for children, making bibliographies, and offering other services both to children and adults, children's and school librarians are *evaluators* of literature. This presupposes that they have backgrounds in literature in general and children's literature in particular. (Although a distinction must be made between children's books and literature for children, both should make up some of the materials used and discussed in the institutes.)

Librarians who work with children, through the agencies of the library and the school, also have an important contribution to make in providing materials and guides for the adults presenting and attending the institutes. Indeed, elementary and secondary education in this country today cannot adequately take place without acknowledging, through support and use, that school libraries are at the heart of the teaching program's adequacy and success. Printed materials on all levels, on all subjects, from all points of view, for children and teachers, are absolutely necessary. It is safe to say that the teaching program cannot be any better than the library materials and services available to teachers and children, and the intelligent use which teachers and children then make of them. This requires excellent school libraries in terms of facilities, collections, and professional and clerical personnel --as outlined in the 1960 Standards published by the American Association of School Librarians.

Not just school libraries, however, but public libraries, are vital to a community's school system and the education of its children. Experience over the past 50 years--studies, surveys--all have made it quite clear that good school libraries and public libraries in the same community lead to increased and better use of both by teachers and children: each supports and abets the other.

Whenever NDEA-sponsored institutes are being planned, the planners should turn to the local public librarian in charge of children's services, to the supervisor of school libraries and to the school librarian (if such exist), and to the State Library. More and more State Libraries now have school and/or children's consultants on their staffs. State Libraries will do their best, even without specialist consultants, to lend materials, provide consultant services, and even participate in the planning and presentation of institutes to which librarians can make a contribution.

A very important place to turn for resource persons, consultation, and materials and bibliographies, are the two following offices of the American Library Association (50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Illinois): Executive secretary for the Children's Services Division, and Executive secretary for the American Association of School Libraries. One should also turn to the State Library Association (which will usually have equivalent divisions).

Specific aids in choosing books for all ages, reading levels, and areas of interest, as well as books about children's books and reading, are available from the American Library Association, State, and local libraries. Lists are also available, for example, from the Children's Book Council in New York City, one such list being "Aids to Choosing Books for Children."

One definite contribution which the Literature Committee of this conference can make would be a listing of specific and typical bibliographies and other aids in selecting and using children's literature. It is suggested that some of these lists and aids be reproduced and included with the final report of this committee. (Also available are lists of materials pertinent to the other four areas covered by this conference.)

## Appendix E. Ned Hedges: The Relationship of Cognitive Theory to the Building of a Curriculum

I think that we must in building a curriculum consider the readiness of children to embrace particular literary concepts at any particular stage of intellectual development. Actually we know very little about these matters, particularly because we have not learned to fragment the study of literature into convenient parts that can be developed in a sequential pattern. The Nebraska Curriculum Program has been able to apply, at least in a very general way, some of the findings or theories, anyway, of Jerome Bruner and Piaget. This Nebraska Curriculum was formulated in an attempt to develop the literature program K-12 according to the "spiral" curriculum theory of Bruner, attempting also to place particular concepts within the spiral curriculum according to the theories of intellectual development in the child as investigated by Piaget.

For example, in attempting to use Bruner's methodology in the development of the concept of the Epic Hero, the Nebraska Program has tried to introduce the elementary school student to miniature epic heroes in a sequence of literary works for children. A first-grade child is not expected to verbalize, or even recognize, the epic traits of courage and self-control when he reads _Little Tim and the Brave Sea Captain_. But the program intends to structure the child's developing notion of the characteristics of an epic hero by providing him with an observable example of a miniature hero in action in such a book as _Little Tim and the Brave Sea Captain_. Then at a later grade level, perhaps third grade, the child may again be exposed to an observable example of an epic hero in action in such a book as _Winnie the Pooh_. The child might see another example of an epic hero in the fifth grade with _Tom Sawyer_ and again in the sixth grade with _The Wind in the Willows_ or _King Arthur_ or _Robin Hood_. Only after the child has been exposed in a spiral reinforcing pattern can we expect him to generalize concerning the dominant traits of a hero in literature "like" epic literature. Thus, the spiral nature of a curriculum provides for the introduction of a concept at one time, a reintroduction of the concept at a later time and again a reinforcement of the concept at an even later time through a more sophisticated, more complex treatment.

The application of Bruner's cognitive theory to the development of curricula is simply (it seems to my oversimplified mind) capitalization on the intuitive method spread out over the total of a child's development in literary understanding; although the child is not asked to verbalize literary concepts before he is intellectually capable of doing so, neither is he asked to verbalize literary concepts without having first had a wealth of specific evidence to draw upon from a long experience with specified literary works.

Authors of the Nebraska plan have attempted in the structuring of the introduction to literary concepts at any particular level to apply, in so far as limited understanding made it possible, the findings of Piaget concerning the stages of intellectual development in the child. For example: fables are introduced at the first grade or even kindergarten level as appealing to children. The composition activities in this curriculum are all directly related to the literary content of the units. Much of the theory of composition is invested in a kind of model writing. Certain literary works, chosen to exhibit a very common plot pattern, are presented (for example, the hero leaves a secure home, journeys into isolation, encounters a monster, overcomes the monster through the use of his wits and returns to the security of his home--the plot not being presented to children in these abstract terms of course); then the students compose stories "like" this story they have just had read to them (making use of flannel board characters to illustrate the sequences of events has proved very effective here).

Now to illustrate the relationship between this kind of model writing and the placement of particular activities in terms of the child's intellectual development, consider the writing of fables. It was discovered that first, second, and third grade children for example could master sequences of events in model writing but they were not capable of writing true fables. The writing of a fable poses another distinct intellectual problem. In order to write a fable, the student must first think in terms of abstractions and relationships between abstractions. He cannot think in terms of animals and animal characteristics and then write a fable that satisfies him. The child must first think of the abstraction, then perceive a means of personifying the abstraction. In studying Piaget we discovered that a child is not generally capable of working from abstraction to a personification of the abstraction until a relatively late stage in his intellectual development. So, the Nebraska program does not ask students to perform this difficult feat until fifth grade level at least.

This brief discussion is not intended to be an explanation of the cognitive theory of Jerome Bruner or an explanation of the theory of Piaget. It simply attempts to set down an example of how such theories can be used to assist the structuring of an elementary school literary program.[1]

---

[1] For further speculations as to the usefulness of cognitive theory (as it deals with pre-operational and operational levels in the development of children's thinking) to the analysis of literature loved by children, cf. "Analyzing Literature in the Elementary Institute," cited _supra_. It should be reported that, in the discussions of the committee, the following books (aside from Frye's _The Educated Imagination_) came up as significant books having to do with literary and artistic experience: Suzanne Langer, _Philosophy in a New Key_ and Ernst Cassirer, _Language and Myth_.

# A PROPOSAL FOR INSTITUTES ON PRE-SCHOOL-ELEMENTARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED

Submitted by an *Ad Hoc*
Committee on Language
and Cultural Deprivation

As a result of three brief sessions, the Committee proposes that eight-week summer institutes be established for nursery and elementary school teachers and supervisors.

While recognizing the importance of teaching English as a second language, the Committee focused this proposal on the culturally deprived.

An institute program consisting of two major components constitutes a model approved by the Committee.

I. Component I should be informational with purposes of developing and refining understandings of the environment of cultural deprivation. Special attention should be directed to the psychological and linguistical development and the socio-anthropological characteristics of culturally deprived children. The concepts of *degree* and *type* of cultural deprivation should be developed in sufficient depth to enable illustration and comparison through similarities and differences.

It was agreed that Component I should be the entire program of the institute for the first two weeks with strands extending throughout the institute. All institute participants, regardless of age-level interests, would share Component I as a common foundational experience.

The activities of participants will be those considered pertinent to developing effectively the desired understandings. Instructional techniques might well utilize films, observation excursions, research reports and resource specialists.

II. Component II should be devoted to programs for culturally deprived children. Each program would include the curriculum, methods, materials and assessment evidence pertinent to each of the three levels: preschool, primary, and intermediate grades. According to the intent of any particular institute, special emphasis within the primary and intermediate programs might be made in terms of language and reading, language and composition or language and literature. It is presumed that in no case would any of these topics be excluded from programs at these levels.

The learning activities of Component II would usually be of three types:

1. Observation of demonstration classes.

2. Preparation of strategies, techniques, materials and evaluation of instruction.

3. Try-out teaching experiences with individuals or small groups of children.

Seminar or work-shop groupings by age or school level should provide adequate cohesiveness and direction.

The personnel involved in conducting an institute of the type envisioned in this proposal would include:

1. A specially-trained cadre of directors with interdisciplinary backgrounds.

2. A group of specialist-consultants representing psychological and linguistic development, sociology and education.

3. Demonstration teachers extremely competent in working with culturally deprived children.

The Committee recognized several serious problems attendant to wide-scale implementation of this proposal. Such problems included the following:

1. There exists a scarcity of well-trained personnel at two levels of institute work.

    a. A cadre of personnel conducting an institute should represent in-depth training in linguistics, sociology, anthropology, psychology of language development and children's literature to an extent significantly greater than that considered to be desirable for a teacher of culturally deprived children.

    It is recommended that to develop these competencies, there should be a fellowship program funded at a level appropriate to the leadership qualities of the fellows.

b. The demonstration teachers used for institute work should have, in addition to exceptional teaching ability, sufficient socio-anthropological, linguistical and psychological understandings to be able to adopt and demonstrate materials, techniques and literature appropriate for the culturally deprived.

2. The Committee considered as a serious problem a dearth of materials, strategies and techniques that integrate the best research evidence from psychology, sociology, anthropology, linguistics, English and educational method.

It is hoped that responsible representatives of those areas will take action to produce cooperatively the kind of strategies and materials so badly needed in meeting the tremendous tasks of helping the culturally deprived.

3. The Committee deemed advisable careful consideration of new and different formats for elementary teacher re-training programs in the area of the language of culturally deprived children. Such possibilities as series of summer institutes, Saturday institutes, year-long institutes, and fellowships were suggested.

Respectfully submitted by the
*Ad Hoc* Committee, consisting
of:

Edith M. Patterson
Joseph McVicker Hunt
Raven I. McDavid, Jr.
Mark Taylor
Jack E. Kittell, Chairman

Appended to this report is a list of persons especially recommended by Dr. Raven McDavid, Jr., as being particularly well qualified to aid in the development of elementary language institutes for the culturally deprived:

Thomas L. Creswell, Portuye, Indiana
Vernon S. Larsen, SRH, Chicago
Carolyn H. Larsen, SRH, Chicago
Sumner Ives, NYU
H. Rex Wilson, RMC, Kingston, Ontario
Virginia McDavid, ITC, Chicago
Roger Shuy, Michigan State
Lee Pederson, Emory
Gerald Udell, Missouri
W. R. Van Riper, LSU
James B. McMillan, U. of Alabama
Suellen Fisher, 5482 S. Greewood,
Chicago, Illinois 60615

# THE ARTS OF LANGUAGE

Owen Thomas
Department of English
Indiana University

Mr. Slaughter in his opening remarks to the Conference, urged us all to "Think Big." I, for one, was at first disconcerted by what seemed to be an emotional appeal to an oversimple cliche. But my admiration for the other things he said forced me to reconsider my original impression, and I began to understand that he was actually urging us to share his vision. He had seen, as most of us--the "insiders"--had not, that beyond the parochialism of our various disciplines there was confusion. He was, in short, urging us to resolve the larger confusion as the first step to resolving our individual problems.

I then began to think about my own sub-culture of the Language Arts, viz., transformational grammar. I was certainly happy within this sub-culture; I found complete professional satisfaction in working with problems which were, in the final analysis, mostly of interest to other transformationalists. Mr. Olson had asked me to address the group, but I knew he wanted me to say more than, "I'm happy"; and I also knew that he didn't invite me just as a "token transformationalist" who would come one day and then leave the next so that the real work of the conference could begin. And while in this confused state, I began to listen to the major position papers of the other conferees.

Mr. Iverson, the first speaker, was obviously thinking beyond the present situation in his discipline. He recognized that the present fragmentation concerning the teaching of reading was debilitating, and he proposed that participants in a summer institute should investigate the reasons for the confusion which the fragmentation causes. He also suggested several new possibilities that teachers might want to consider. One which struck me as extremely interesting was the possibility of using expository prose in basal readers.

Mr. Brown, in his position paper on speech, seemed to adopt the same fundamental position. Specifically, he saw speech as a kind of cornerstone to instruction in the Language Arts; that is, he took literally the linguistic dictum that, in language, speech is primary. I was impressed by his attempt to look beyond the present situation in the classroom in the hope of seeing unity.

Mrs. Saunders, the third speaker, was equally precise. She stressed the need for teachers to see beyond the drudgery of the writing process to the joy which a writer takes in his product. She urged teachers not to concentrate on the mechanical act of writing, particularly not on such things as neatness, but rather to consider the philosophy that underlies all forms of composition.

Finally, to this point in the conference, Mr. Allen stressed the kinds of linguistic knowledge that teachers need beyond that which they already have. He made the point that is obvious to most of us but is overlooked by many of our colleagues, viz., that the things which an institute participant learns should not necessarily work their way into a lesson plan which teachers can use "at two o'clock on Tuesday." In other words, much of what an institute participant learns is intended to be of help in forming an "attitude" toward the Language Arts.

All of these speakers, in fact, were "thinking big"; they were thinking beyond the present situation in the classroom to the ways in which their disciplines might be better understood by teachers and better taught to children.

Listening to these remarks, some of which--as a parochial linguist--I disagreed with, but most of which seemed to me to be theoretically sound, I became concerned about two things. The first relates to my own quite limited experience inside elementary classrooms; the second to Mr. Slaughter's opening remarks. And for the first time I began to wonder whether our emphasis on the Language Arts was wrong; whether, in fact, we should not shift the emphasis to the Arts of Language.

My first concern was with the classroom. On those occasions when I have been fortunate enough to serve as a teacher of young children, I've been amazed, even stunned, by the sheer quantity of work which a teacher must accomplish. How can we suggest that she do more? Unless we can solve this problem, it seems to me, what we at this conference produce can't possibly be useful to most teachers.

This fact bothered me. The suggestions made by the earlier speakers had (with the exception of a few points that I'd enjoy arguing about) been good. Children could profit from them. Then I realized that this bore directly on my second concern, that--in fact--this was exactly what Mr. Slaughter was saying. Let me re-phrase his point as I now understand it.

Given, first, the fact that elementary teachers, in the vast majority of cases, are already overburdened. (Time is not elastic.) And given, second, the fact that there is much useful material which children are not now getting but which could be profitable to them as well as enjoyable for them. Then, what do we do?

To put the question another way. Is there a theoretical framework which can encompass the present classroom situation (i. e., permit, at the very least, the teacher to see how the parts are exactly that, parts of a whole) and--at the same time that it encompasses the present, can it also provide a direction of growth toward the future (as this future has been outlined, in part, by the previous speakers)?

(Obviously, I wouldn't ask myself such a question in public if I didn't have a partial answer.)

In sum, I think there is a theoretical framework, the same one being used by our colleagues in other academic disciplines, the same one--in fact--that makes the marvels of the twentieth century possible. Specifically, I am referring to the major development in the field of Philosophy in this century; symbolic logic; in other words, the theory of systems.

Language, above all, is a system, the most complex, extensive, and even dazzling system ever developed by man, vastly more complex than even the largest electronic computer. Like all systems, however, language can be discussed--as philosophers have shown us--according to three major divisions: (1) elements, (2) operations, and (3) laws. The elements of language are the sounds, the words, and so on; the operations combine these elements in various systematic ways; and the laws restrict the range of the operations.

This is true for all systems. Consider the "new math." Fundamental to a discussion of any aspect of mathematics (e. g., addition, subtraction, multiplication, and so on) is an understanding of the system of mathematics: its elements, operations, and laws. In exactly the same way, an understanding of the system of the arts of language is fundamental to a discussion of the individual arts.

As a linguist, I am primarily interested in the nature of the system itself. It delights me. But I recognize every day, almost every hour, that most persons do not share my delight in the system as system. Rather, these other persons are interested in various uses of the system, in the arts to which the system applies. And here, it seems to me, is the basis for all instruction in a summer institute.

Fundamental to each institute should be a course in the nature of the system of language. Complementary to this, there should be courses--modules--which are concerned with the application of this system in various areas: speech, composition, drama, reading, and so on. Not all participants in the institutes would take all the available modules; probably not all possible modules would be offered at each institute. But as each participant worked within a module, she would see how the theoretical basis of that module was the same as for every other module. She would also begin to see how the modules interact, how--in fact--it is possible to instruct children in several "arts" at the same time. And this, I decided, is the point that Mr. Slaughter was making.

In short, I am suggesting that we produce a flexible syllabus that would focus, in the first place, on the nature of the system of language, and then, in the second place, would apply the notions derived from this first consideration to a variety of particular "arts." If I may conclude by extending a concept which Chomsky first stated last November at the N. C. T. E. annual meeting: the linguist is concerned with defining "rule-governed creativity" in language (the system whereby each of us can, potentially, construct an infinite number of sentences); the others in the broad field of the English Language Arts are concerned with "directing rule-governed creativity" in various significant ways.

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

2-2-68